School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1412544

LIBRARY

Southern California
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
Claremont, California

Aus der Bibliothek
von
Walter Bauer

geboren 1877
gestorben 1960

MYTH AND CONSTANTINE THE GREAT

Oxford University Press
London Edinburgh Glasgow Copenhagen
New York Toronto Melbourne Cape Town
Bombay Calcutta Madras Shanghai
Humphrey Milford Publisher to the UNIVERSITY

DG
315
B87

Myth & Constantine the Great

Constantinus I, The Great.

By

Vacher Burch, D.D.

Lecturer in Theology, Liverpool Cathedral

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
1927

TO

ALEXANDER NAIRNE

FOR THE GRACE OF HIS HUMAN HELP

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

PREFACE

A FRESH examination of the legends which have gathered about Constantine has led to the discovery of a primal *Vita Constantini* as their source. This document was an early Romano-Sabine product. It displaces the Near East as the creator of the tales which gave the Constantine-Silvester literature such vogue in the Middle Age. For from it came those vital religious and literary motives which caused Sabine things to take on the apparel of Catholic beliefs. *Soracte* [1] is shown, for example, to be older than *Syrapti*, both in the religion and literature of Constantine. Thus Duchesne's findings must be revised. Through the *Vita* new views emerge concerning the text and criticism of the *Liber Pontificalis*. Constantine is seen in another light as a founder of churches. He is shown never to have founded a church to a person. He had no part, as we shall see, in the Peter basilica at Rome. For this *Vita* affords us a more sensitive view of his mind, from Dacian days to the end of his life, than we can gain from a

[1] For mediaeval spellings of this name see Tomassetti, *Archivio delle R. Soc. Romana di Storia Patria*, 1884, 414 ff.

study of his numerous coins.[1] Also by means of new documentary discovery, on the Christian side of the problem of Constantine, we are able to show that the Dacian, who found a spiritual home in Romano-Sabine beliefs, ventured only a short distance from its threshold towards the Christ who bore an early name of *Sophia*.[2] These are among the findings in the following pages for a renewal of the evidence for Constantine.

This short preface may not be closed without mention of two who have added to the joys of work on the book. I am in constant and present debt to my friend Mr. A. I. Ellis of the British Museum for the ways by which he eases my access to the treasures of that incomparable place. And the Secretary to the Delegates of the Clarendon Press has laid on me a delightful burden of obligation by his courtesy and care towards my book, especially when I was ill.

[1] Baynes, *The Byzantine Empire*, 1925, 16 f. ; and *The Historia Augusta: Its Data and Purpose*, 1926, 58 f., has been led by the coins to see the pagan and Christian Constantine in black and white ; whereas on both sides of his mind the true Constantine is to be found in the *nuances*.

[2] Cp. Zielinski, *La Sibylle*, 1924, 125, who argues that in the Sibylline utterances and modes " nous trouvons le véritable Ancien Testament de notre christianisme." These documentary discoveries will show that even when Klarian Sibyls are used by the early Christians they are put into a literary context which alters all their connotations. Apollo does undreamt-of service to Jesus Christ.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. General Observations on the Simpler Constantine Myths -	1
II. Constantine and Baptism - -	26
Analysis of the Chief Literary Witnesses for Baptismal Legend	71
III. Constantine and Anthousa - -	76
IV. Constantine and Claudian Descent - - - - - - -	105
V. Constantine and the Founding of the City - - - - -	116
VI. Constantine and the Building of Churches - - - - -	131
VII. Constantine and the Convocation of the Jewish Disputants - -	163
VIII. Constantine and Oratory - -	181
Index to Authors Cited - -	227
Biblical Citations - - -	232

I

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE SIMPLER CONSTANTINE MYTHS

SOME years ago a French authority on the archaeology of the eastern part of the Mediterranean world[1] offered to scholars a generalisation which was crystallised in the attractive phrase 'la mythologie optique.' He thought that the eye as well as the ear had to do with the making of myths. Thus, if stories told in huts and boats and fields made the Greek epics, then the oriental tales told in line on gems and vases and coins made the ocular tradition for the Greek artist who worked in carnelian or clay or gold. The theory might have helped us to understand very much if Phoenicia had not been doing in those days what Egypt is attempting in ours, that is, to interpret the world of man's spiritual activities in the terms of herself as having been their creator or creative inspirer. That subject belongs to other spheres and times of discussion. The fourth

[1] Clermont-Ganneau, *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature*, 1878, 220.

century is neither moved nor understood by such speculations. And yet if the principle of 'la mythologie optique' is used for the examination of myths made in that and later times; and if to the hard substances into which they could be impressed is added that most impressionable of all media, the written word, there can be little doubt that it will form a delicate indicator to show how the thing was done. This instrument is too fine to be of service to test the whole of hagiographical literature. Its bulk is made according to an insensitive exemplary mode. The tales have, for the most part, the air of an almost mathematical modelling—their wonders and virtues and sentiments seem measured, or always in place, or pointing the expected moral—save in those instances where local history has passed into the *Vita*, like that of a monastery or a chancellory; or cult history, when the process can be watched of ancient god or goddess passing into the verbal, and thence into the worshipped, person of some Christian saint. In these last *Vitae* the principle of Clermont-Ganneau's theory could do some of its work of discrimination. The myths which have gathered about Constantine are of the sort where it can be seen most fully at work. They yield to its faculty of discovering two orders of effects—the broad and the subtle. The first could, of course, be found without any theoretical apparatus: since it is a commonly recognised pheno-

menon that if a prominent personage begins to acquire virtues, subsequent tellers of tales concerning him are ruled by their presumptively inherent quality of cumulation. The stories told about Constantine's saintliness or his passion for building churches, we assume as a rule, are instances of this cumulative energy. A third order of legend of the sort to which reference is made would appear to be that which tells us about the emperor's founding of Constantinople. A recent commentator[1] on them has claimed that they exhibit how the notion of Constantine's piety was interwoven with almost everything he did. The matter seems so obvious that it looks as if any dispute would be a waste of time. The reference of Sozomen,[2] supported by the Theodosian Code,[3] appears to be a plain example of the recognised quantity that an act of Constantine's must be an act of God. There would be little fascination in the study of the growth of fourth century and later myths if there was nothing more in the matter of their creation than an obtrusive orthodox theology and a succession of writers devoted to its interpenetration of and monopoly over the person and history of this emperor. We shall find when this particular series of stories

[1] Coleman, *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law* (Columbia University), 1914, vol. lx. pt. i.

[2] *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 3.

[3] Dec. i. *sub ann.* 334, xiii. 5, 7.

comes up for examination that such conclusions are out of harmony with all the evidence ; and that there is reason still for belief in the engaging interest of the biology of myths.

At present we may notice that this way of using them misses those factors which ' la mythologie optique ' would evoke. No notion of ' mass ' or ' line ' is afforded us. The thing is not seen as if it were that which had its growth from an ocular image that began with the historic figure set in a peculiar literary context. Thus, we may not judge the stories of the building of churches in the same way as we must judge the stories of the founding of Constantinople. Eusebius [1] may say that the emperor made architectural provision in the church said to have been dedicated to the Apostles which was suggested by the number of their company, and we may feel ourselves untroubled in concluding that such an account has its simple and natural basis in fact ; thence we may be inclined to agree that in the Eusebian statement the architectural motive merges into a movement of religious faith, and doing this he would receive post-mortem honours equal to those accorded to the Apostles. But what if the historic fact has to go ? There would seem then small ground for the religious fact which is said to have had its rise in the intuition of Constantine. We will leave the controversial phases of this

[1] *Vita Const.* iv. 60.

portion of the Eusebian *Vita* until our chapter where the stories of church-building are examined. From the ' optical ' point of view it can be pointed out that there is clear evidence for the fact that Eusebius is working according to the ' mass ' and ' line ' of the Constantine he ' sees.' This illustration offers no other complexity than that of the historical truth of its statement about the actual building of the church to the Apostles. It is simple ; and its ocular mode is as simple as itself.

When we turn to the tales concerning the foundation of the city we find no like simplicity. For Sozomen has to be viewed, for instance, with the evidence of Philostorgius and Aldhelm and Joannes Lydus. That is to say, there is here evidence for the historic figure in a discoverable first context, and as well for certain accretions to figure and statements. He will have been ' seen ' twice, if not thrice ; and literary men have worked to their models. In the statements of the four writers just mentioned there is not merely the embroidery work of piety—or in Philostorgius, for example, the lack of both that sort of embroidery and piety, because he has a weakness for the Arians—but also the commingling of a strain of evidence that is altogether foreign to Christianity. This certainty should prevent us from treating the two lines of myth in the same way. Even the reply that hitherto the pagan strain and tradition has not been disclosed scarcely releases us from

coming to conclusions that handle the tales as if they were Christian in all details. We should have felt that something else was in them beyond the history and poetry of Christianity. Perhaps, too, we ought to have been aware that someone else was in them besides the Constantine drawn by Eusebius; another earlier, perhaps truer, Constantine than he who has passed into ordinary historical statement. This man can be found with the help of the discriminative principle we have discussed. Before that more exquisite work is done there is need to show, from the two kinds of simpler myths concerning the emperor, more about the presence in such narratives of what have been called ' mass ' and ' line.'

The *Vita Constantini* of Eusebius is the source of inspiration for later tales about the emperor's saintliness. Now concerning some of the latter, few students would have any difficulty in recognising and allowing for their ' optical ' qualities. When Anna Comnena [1] claims that Constantine is co-equal with the Apostles, and the late account of him included in the *Acta Sanctorum* [2] affirms the claim with his canonicity, the admission is prompt that Constantine is being ' seen ' from the standpoint of a church and kingdom he had founded. The figure that Eusebius had portrayed was larger in ' mass ' and ' line ' because of the

[1] *Alexiad.* xiv. (*P.G.* cxxxi. 1101 A).

[2] *Maii* xv. 13 (Vigesima Prima).

continuity of those two considerable historical facts. A man does look bigger when the institution he began has assumed a very large place in the world. It belongs to the genialities of human judgement that he should be seen on the scale of his growing achievement. To disallow this factor would mean that most of the historical works previous to Hume—with the exception of the bare-boned *Chronica*—would have to be added to the literature of Folk-lore. These things can perhaps be looked upon as the received commonplaces of criticism. Our problems begin to be sharp when we turn to ask whether it is exact to say that Eusebius himself is influenced by these 'optical' determinants. It is not now the question of Eusebius' trustworthiness as a historian, but rather one that concerns a part of his method. This is not a new subject. It is one, indeed, that has been given large space in the modern study of the Eusebian writings, and especially where they concern themselves with Constantine. An instance is in Crivellucci's[1] study on them. That scholar thought that Eusebius wrote the *Vita* solely for the glory of Christianity and the Church of Christ. An excellent case can be made out for this opinion. There is much that is hortatory in the book. It could not well be otherwise. But Crivellucci goes on to the second position in his

[1] *Della Fede Storica di Eusebio nella Vita di Constantino* (1888).

view, which is that Eusebius did not write the history of Constantine but the life of a model emperor personified in him. Or, if his view is more directly put, Constantine was made to be the personification of the Christian religion—the perfect knight before friend and foe of the Church. Again, certain textual support can be found for this further position in the Italian scholar's views. These two phases do not make a complete explanation. They establish that Eusebius was engaged in one of the gentler forms of literary polemic: and he was. Baronius [1] had anticipated most of this explanation of the Eusebian manner when he suggested that the parallel to the *Vita Constantini* is in the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon. Baronius had his view of the classical writer from Cicero,[2] who said that Xenophon had not written history, but rather the picture of the ideal prince. Baronius makes the Caesarean writer imitate the Athenian writer, as does the Italian writer after him. There is then a traditionalism in literary opinion; and to that Crivellucci has conformed. It is somewhat right; but it is not altogether right. It does not get the Eusebian 'mass' and 'line' correct.

The men who made these for Eusebius were other than Cyrus or Alexander. A reference to

[1] *Annales*, iv. 32, § v.

[2] *Ep. ad Quintum Fratrem*, i. 23 (ed. Wesenberg, 1885, I. iii. 565).

the *Vita* will show that Moses and Isaiah and Paul [1] mean more for him as he writes of Constantine than any pagan prince or literature recording his deeds. It is noticeable that the bishop does not draw analogies in circumstances between them and the emperor. There is a sort of kaleidoscopy about the art of Eusebius. The three spiritual princes have poured their purple and gold into the 'mass' that Eusebius sees when he thinks of a Christian emperor, and this he dramatically personalises in the prince named Constantine. This optical experience is not dependent on a literary exemplar like the *Cyropaedia*. Certain events in Constantine's life have called up the 'mass' and 'line' to which he works.

The story of the lit vision in which Constantine is said to have seen the Cross evokes for the bishop the figure of Paul; and that not by way of literary allusion. There is a blending of him who saw a great light on the way to Damascus with the elect from the Old Testament, so that their composite self moves in the person of the fourth century emperor. They have assumed in their unity those incidents in the life of Constantine that the bishop considers to be significant. It can be demonstrated that Eusebius possessed an instinct of

[1] *Vita Const.* xii. etc. Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 31 (*P.G.* lxxxii. 989 B), has caught the manner, but at a different angle, when he introduces David to apologise for the fact that Constantine had made exiles of a good many bishops.

spiritual aristocracy. He could not eliminate it when writing about Constantine who inaugurated the Christian Church in Byzantium. Literature tells us that when a writer possesses that instinct, whether of spiritual or social or intellectual aristocracy, and he has to write the life of one who can enshrine it, then he will achieve his purpose by limning the residual figure he sees of those who for him are the greatest within the figure of the person he celebrates. The hortatory purpose of his book is subsidiary to his ' optical ' design. The praise of Eusebius for Constantine is high, not because he is a preacher trying to be a historian but because he is a historian with a certain order of sight educed in him by his subject. Thus the myth of Constantine's saintliness is the product of the ' optical ' inhibitions of ' mass ' and ' line ' in the mind of Eusebius. Those who wrote about the emperor, and particularly of this phase of his character, where they did not patently deprave the Eusebian method so as to make Constantine a moral figment, there they drew from the progress of the institutions connected with the imperial name to deepen the mass and colour or to sharpen the outline of the Eusebian figure whose hands were Constantine's but whose mind was in some part the emperor's ; and in other part the objective interfusion of the man Eusebius saw as he dwelt upon the deeds of Constantine. This myth of saintliness is one of the simpler sort in the histories

of Constantine. It gives us its own story, and as well the method of its creator, if we treat it according to the principle of ' la mythologie optique.'

A second sort of the simpler myth has been mentioned, where we are told of the exceeding prowess of Constantine as a builder of churches. The central problem it presents can be reached only when the Byzantine documents are studied. The notice of Silvester in the *Liber Pontificalis*,[1] however, owes much to these tales. The late Monsignor Duchesne has passed two judgements upon them as they are incorporated with the lists of the popes.[2] First, he considers that the appendix to the notice of Silvester which gives these details of Constantine's foundations from Rome to Sicily was not a part of the original Silvester document ; second, that in this appendix we have at least the popular tradition of the first years of the sixth century about the origin of such Christian monuments. These judgements have the sure and lucid notes which characterised the work of that great scholar. Further discovery cannot spoil them, but only add to their truth.

As a preface to the fuller study of this sort of myth, and in harmony with the intention of this chapter, a sentence from the *Liber Pontificalis* will be chosen for critical comment : ' XVI. Eodem tempore Augustus Constantinus fecit

[1] ed. Duchesne, 1886, i. 170 ff.

[2] Duchesne, *Étude sur le Liber Pontificalis*, 1876, 147 f.

basilicam beato Petro apostolo in templum Apollinis.' It is the most notable claim made for the emperor in the Silvester document. The sentence is as problematical as it is important. The eminent editor of the *Liber Pontificalis* has seen and answered its problems according to the results of research at the time he was editing its documents. There is then a question of foundation and another of site. We will take them in the reverse order of our statement. The phrase 'in templum Apollinis' allows of no solution if the actual site of the basilica is appealed to as arbiter.[1] Duchesne is driven to suggest that in the designation there must be a recollection of a sanctuary of *Mater magna*; and that the confusion arose because of the close relations which were brought about, in the last days of paganism, between the cult of the Phrygian Cybele and the religion of Mithra-Helios.

The suggested answer has its own naturalness—a cult error in an ancient document, though it is made in two different notices in the *Liber Pontificalis*, and an actual sanctuary not far removed from the site of the basilica are contributors to what appears to be a satisfactory solution. Still Apollo is not Cybele; nor will the cult equation suggested by Duchesne, Cybele plus Mithra-Helios, work out as Apollo—even could we accept all Preger's[2] conclusions from references in Byzantine

[1] Cp. Duchesne, i. 120 and 193. [2] *Hermes*, 1901, 457 ff.

writers concerning a Constantine who became clothed with the attributes of the sun-god. A much nearer solution for the inexactitude [1] arises from discoveries which appear later in this book. This designation is due to that stage of the literary tradition concerning Constantine when the primitive Roman *Vita* of the emperor coalesced with the Graeco-Latin *Vitae Constantini et Sylvestri*. Thence issued the Silvester document in the *Liber Pontificalis* and with it the Apolline reference. The occurrence of the same designation in the Peter notice : [2] ' Qui sepultus est via Aurelia, in templum Apollinis,' is an instance of harmonistic treatment in the Symmachian recension, if thus that sixth century version of the *Liber* may be named which shows the influence of apocryphal literature compiled in the time of Symmachus. The site is not firmer than words. The question now arises as to the foundation. So far as we have gone we can see that this second kind of story has its origin in the Eusebian ' mass.' Two other factors as well make for its extension : the fact that Constantine did build certain churches ; and a second factor that some narrators have represented Constantine as the builder of others. Both these factors could be impulses towards growth in the number of the emperor's foundations, and, also, an inflatory

[1] Cp. Duchesne (i. 120), ' Il est clair que l'expression *in templum Apollinis* est inexacte.'

[2] *Lib. Pont.* i. 118.

influence in the accounts of them. The companion sentence in the *Liber Pontificalis,* to that we have touched upon, must be examined once more with those considerations in view: 'XVI. Eodem tempore Augustus Constantinus fecit basilicam beato Petro Apostolo in templum Apollinis.'

The accretive activities of the alleged accounts of Constantine's doings is illustrated when at the outset it has to be said that the later investigators of this sentence have concerned themselves not so much with itself as with an alleged implication. They have studied not the capital question whether Constantine did build the basilica, but the implied question that has to do with a confirmatory mosaic and inscription which are said to have been in the church. A sentence from the most recent edition of a sixteenth century archaeological work on the basilica [1] will place us easily at this point of approach. In the well-known book *De Basilicae Vaticanae Antiquissima et Nova Structura,* by Tiberius Alpharanos, occurs this passage:

> Morum igitur exemplo, Beati Petri Apostoli Corpus intra Altare maius ad similitudinem Arcae extructum in Basilicae medio intra sancto sanctorum idest intra absidem et Basilicae transversam navem quae dicuntur sancta sanctorum, sub cherubini alis, idest sub argenteo tegmine deaurato cherubinis insculpto, honorifice condiderunt, totamque absidem elegantissimis musiveis

[1] Cerratti, *Tiberii Alpharani De Basilicae Vaticanae* (*Studi e Testi,* 26, 1914), 29 and accompanying note.

figuris exornarunt, in que hoc versiculos in rei memoriam insculpserunt :

> Quod duce te mundus surrexit in astra triumphans
> Hanc Constantinus victor tibi condidit aulam.

On this passage Cerratti comments : ' Il *Liber Pontificalis* non dice esplicitamente che Constantino e Papa Silvestro abbiano fatto fare il mosaico : ma lo si può acguire facilamento come già osservava il Janningus (*A.SS.* vii. *Junii*, p. 134).' It is certainly not explicitly said that Constantine and pope Silvester had put up this mosaic; but it is most certainly explicitly said by the compilers of the notice in the *Acta Sanctorum*. The authority cited in support of such an intrusive reading in the Silvester notice is the item in the Severinus notice [1] that says : ' Hic renovavit absidem beati Petri apostoli ex musibo, quod dirutum erat.'

Up to the year 1882, which was the time when Müntz [2] published his study on the mosaic to illustrate his contention that sixteenth century archaeologists had preserved authentic notes of the fourth century structure, the received opinion was in agreement with that of Cerratti. In 1883 Frothingham [3] had unearthed a reference from the *De Concilio Tractatus* by the Cardinal Dominic Jacobacci, a work issued in 1537, where in the

[1] *Lib. Pont.* i. 329. Duchesne, *op. cit.* 193, had made these literary connections before Cerratti.

[2] *Revue Archéologique*, 1882, 143 ff.

[3] *Revue Archéologique*, 1883, 68 ff.

course of a defence of the Donation of Constantine was the statement :

> Porro multi malignantur contra sedem apostolicam propter istam donationem, et ante culpant quam legant, quod mirum est : cum adhuc temporibus nostris fuerit in ecclesia Sancti Petri in frontispitio majoris arcus ante altare majus Constantinus imperator in musivo depictus, literis aureis ostendens Salvatori et beato Petro apostolo ecclesiam ipsam a se aedificatam, videlicet ecclesiam Sancti Petri.

The discoverer of this statement saw its differences, for instance, from the Alpharanus passage. The main one is about the site of the mosaic ; for Jacobacci moves it to the position of greatest prominence in the basilica. His right to do so rests apparently on the witness of his eyes. Frothingham invokes the testimony of Andrea Fulvio in support of the cardinal. The passage in the 1527 edition of Fulvio's book [1] reads :

> Est enim Mons (*i.e.* Vaticanus) omnibus nunc nostissimus, ubi sedes apostolica, et basilica Petri apostolorum principis, quam Constantinus Imperator a fundamentis excitauit juxta aedem Apollonis ex quibus ipso suis humeris xii corbulas terrae in honorem xii Apostolorum asportauit. Ornauit que pulcherrimis rerum ornamentis et precipue locum, ubi ossa, et cineres

[1] *Antiquitates Urbis per Andream Fulvium Antiquarium.* Ro. Nuperrime aeditae. Date: Die xv Februarii. M.D.XXVII. Pontificatus nostri Anno quarto. The Pope is Clement VII. Frothingham, *op. cit.* 72, says that Fulvius was published in 1525. Panzer, *Annales Typographici*, xi. 354, gives the date as 1527. This date is upheld by the British Museum Catalogue.

Apostolorum Petri, et Pauli condita aequali portione dicuntur, quem gemines auro argento, et cupro decorauit, Elargitus que est olosericas vestes, ac vasa ad rem sacram pertinentia, legebatur nuper in abside quae nunc diruta est Distichion ex musino paucis notum:

Quod duce te mundus surrexit in astra triumphans
Hanc Constantinus victor tibi condidit aulam.

The 1545 edition has exactly the same text. Now, of course, Fulvio's support for Jacobacci lies simply in the phrases: 'legebatur nuper' and 'nunc diruta.' Their information about the place of the mosaic does not agree. Frothingham concludes, and Duchesne[1] after him, that Dominic Jacobacci must be correct—such an inscription would have the chief place in the basilica. Therefore this alteration in site, which is claimed as solving the difficulties of archaeologists down to the time of its discovery, who have felt that such a monument ought to have been in full view of those who entered the church, came into the text of the *De Concilio Tractatus*, either by personal observation on the part of the author of that book, or it may be in some other way. Cardinal Dominic Jacobacci died in the same year as Fulvio's book appeared in print; therefore the contemporary ocular evidence concerning this monument ought to have been alike. If Jacobacci were exact, then the polemist had taken greater care than the archaeologist to verify his facts. The ideal polem-

[1] *Op. cit.* i. 193

ist would be just such a student. The composition of Jacobacci's pages that contain his apology for the pseudo-Constantinian document is the work of one who verifies and reverifies his facts. On that subject more must be said; there is, however, another phase to this question of the cardinal's testimony.

The *Antiquitates Urbis* by Fulvio had not been out many years before two translations into Italian had been made. In 1543, Paulo dal Rosso [1] issued his; and in 1588, came that by Girolamo Ferrucci.[2] The 1543 translator follows Fulvio's text with literal care until he comes to the passage about the site of the mosaic, which he renders: 'Leggauasi poco fa sopra la tribuna maggiore, laquale hora è rouinata un distico saputo da pochi commesso di Musaico'; the 1588 translator has the same rendering. Neither of them has any description of the figures composing the mosaic. Here again it may be urged that Dominic Jacobacci was more exact than Fulvio or his translators. It is true that the Italian phrase is a little vague; for the word 'tribuna' has several meanings. There is no doubt from the chronological point of view, that a change from Fulvio's

[1] *Opera Di Andrea Fulvio Del le antichità della Città di Roma, et della edificii memorabili di quella. Tradotta nuouamente di latino in lingua toscana.* . . . Con il priuilegio del sommo Pontefice Paulo III., per anni x. 84*a*.

[2] *L'Antichità di Roma Di Andrea Fulvio Antiquario Romano*, 1588, 66*b*.

designation of site has occurred subsequent to the death of Dominic Jacobacci. The translations demonstrate that change ; while the Latin writers on archaeology—the successors of Fulvio—maintain the tradition incorporated in the *Liber Pontificalis*. Alpharanus is evidence on that point ; and he died on 22nd September, 1596, as the *Liber Mortuorum* of the Basilica Vaticana informs us.[1] But, it should be asked, is not the *De Concilio* to be classed among those Latin writings, and especially with those that are contemporary with Fulvio ?

This writing by Dominic Jacobacci was published eleven years after his death by Cardinal Christopher Jacobacci—that is in 1538, or five years before the translation of Paulo dal Rosso came from the printer's hands. The translator was a Florentine—a fact that does not mean an essential vagueness when a Roman writer is turned into the popular tongue. Ferrucci was a Roman, as the title-page of his book informs us, ' Girolamo Ferrucci Romano,' who has corrected and added to and annotated Fulvio's book : yet he has the same turn of phrase as the Florentine. It can be surmised that he has Paulo dal Rosso in his library ; hence he follows his predecessor in the work of translating Fulvio. That is a possible answer to the question he raises. Thus, there remains the problem either of coincidence in

[1] Cerratti, *op. cit.* xii.

designation between Jacobacci and dal Rosso, or knowledge on the part of the translator of the polemist's change of the site of the mosaic, or some influence of a more general kind that affected the Italy of the middle of the sixteenth century. The lack of the descriptive additions from Jacobacci's sentences in Paulo dal Rosso and Garrucci is evidence enough that the *De Concilio* was unknown to them. In the period marked out by Fulvio down to his Florentine translator there is at work throughout Italy a profound and general influence of which Christopher Jacobacci is to be described accurately as being one of its creators. During the year, in which he had edited Dominic Jacobacci's book, he was appointed Papal Legate to the Roman Emperor.[1] The coincidence of the issue of the book and his appointment should not go unmarked. For Jacobacci is now the theory of the last portion of *De Concilio* translated into active advocacy. The last great battle is in array for the classic theory of the creative relations between the Papacy and the imperial or sovereign attributes of European rulers: Jacobacci is sent to Charles V.[2] The tiny sheaf of letters from the Cardinal,[3] which are mild in tone, reveal dimly as

[1] *E.g.* Pieper, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der ständigen Nuntiaturen*, 1894, 115 f.; Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 1912, xi. 107.

[2] Text of the Decree: Ehses, *Concilii Tridentini Actorum*, 1904, IV. i, 452.

[3] Ehses, *op. cit.* IV. i, 147 f.

in a mirror the sense and power of his mission. German and English Protestantism appears as the second reason for the convoking of the Council. The status of the Church and the Apostolic See is its first motive. The *Decree* says that the *De Concilio,* like all writings of its class, had but anticipated and made towards the expression of that fundamental concern. When Quirini[1] writes his biography of Paul III., and reaches the part played by Henry VIII. of England in the pope's time, he mordantly impresses the classic theory by means of a criticism of Burnet the historian. These are commonly known matters. What perhaps had not been realised is that in the middle of the sixteenth century Constantine had been given a new rôle ; he was, from the point of view of the classic theory, the ideal emperor.[2] That is the part given him in the *De Concilio* by its editor. The novel and prominent site for a mosaic representation of the true relations of the *Imperium* and the *Ecclesia,* for both of which there is no previous

[1] *Imago . . . Expressa in Gestis Pauli III. Farnesii,* 1745, 45 ff.

[2] Is there not a subtle use of Constantine as ideal emperor, and with the same context as Jacobacci, in Cardinal Pole's *De Baptismo Constantini* (ed. Manutius, 1562, 63 *a*) : ' nec enim verisimile est, hominum semper in armis incoatum tam magna animo unquam complexurum fuisse, quae suae religionis et fidei praeclarissima monumenta futura essent, nisi prius consulto aliquo sacrorum perito antiste qui eum de fide, deinque omni cultu Dei et institutus Constantinus fuit ; a quo potius, quam a Silvestro, cuius Pontificalis plurimos imperii illius annos est complexus.'

evidence, exquisitely symbolises the mind and mission of the legate who has been called by a historian of to-day 'the gentle Jacobacci.' The external conflict, of which these things are the inner illustrations, caused Paulo dal Rosso to render Fulvio's text, where it describes the site of that mosaic, in language that has general agreement with the editor of *De Concilio*.

One feature of the designation in the varied sixteenth century accounts as to the position of an inscription that is alleged to be Constantinian is contained in the phrase recorded in the *Sylloge Einsiedlensis*: 'IN ARCU SCI PETRI.' After that plain piece of information the two strophes are given with the reading 'triumphans' in the first of them.[1] Therefore, between the eighth and ninth centuries, which is Mommsen's date for the *Sylloge*, there is one piece of evidence for an inscription in the then Peter Church at Rome. There is then a factor that is not contemporaneous with Christopher Jacobacci in his polemical statement. A document of the second half of the eighth century at the earliest is far from Constantine's time. The bridge made between two distant dates by the note in the Severinus

[1] *C.I.L.* VI. i. 6 or de Rossi *Inscps. Christ.* II. i. 20. Mai, *Script. Vet. Nova Coll.* v. 105 read 'triumphus' He shared the opinion of Muratori (*Novus Thes. Vet. Inscp.* iv. MDCCCLIII.) on the inscription 'sed post aliquot ab eo saecula factam puto.' More recent writers have turned against the scepticism of Muratori.

entry of the *Liber Pontificalis* is too frail to bear any weight. It requires a vast amount of buttressing, in the shape of conjecture, from sixteenth century writings to make it a bridge of any sort. Moreover, there is evidence for an important line of evidence [1] for the *Liber*, that omits the phrase ' ex musibo ' from the sentence in question. The sole archaeological consideration that can bear the weight at all of giving truth a way over to Constantine's time from that of the compiler of the *Sylloge* is Grimaldi's statement that when he investigated Old St. Peter's bricks were found bearing the name *Dominus Noster Constantinus Augustus*. He said also ' that the architraves and friezes differed from one intercolumniation to another, and that some of them were inscribed with the names and phrases of Titus, Trajan, Gallienus and others.' [2] Duchesne puts a little weight on this clue as a bringer together of the centuries.[3] The authenticity of Grimaldi's statement needed not be doubted ; it is the rightness of the conclusion drawn from it that causes doubt. Some place must be given to all the facts recorded by Grimaldi ; and when it is seen, as we must from the

[1] Duchesne's A^2 ; *i.e.* Cod. Laurentiamus S. Marci, 604, Xsc. *Lib. Pont.* I. clxvi.

[2] Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome*, 1892, 133. See also, for example, Marini, *Iscrizioni Antiche Dolari*, 1884, 73 f. ; Grisar, *Rom beim Ausgang der antiken Welt*, 1901, 238, or the older book by Ciampini, *De Sacris Aedificiis*, 1693, 29 f.

[3] *Op. cit.* I. cv.

above citation, that the name of Constantine appears as one among a fairly long list of imperial names all of which were used in different parts of the building, we should enquire if one name more than another could determine the date of the foundation. It must be claimed that this architectural peculiarity cannot bridge the gap in time nor settle indisputably the problem whether or not this church was built by Constantine. This criticism is not prompted by the silence of five centuries, since most of the chief discoveries made in the course of this book harmonise together to deny the correctness of the assertions that Constantine could at the time alleged have been the founder of a church to Peter; that he could have been celebrated in an inscription and mosaic to whose Christological content he was a stranger; that the church building tradition in the Silvester notice of the *Liber Pontificalis*, to which the inscription is pendant, has any other value than the baptismal notice[1] with its architectural accompaniments. There are also other fresh considerations of almost equal value.

The second kind of simpler myth concerning Constantine must not be judged by the complexity of the way we have to go in order that conclusions may be reached. It is not due, as will have been thought, to what we have called the Eusebian 'mass' and 'line.' This sort comes from a

[1] *Lib. Pont.* i. 174, xiii.

purely literary process of extension, and is post-Constantinian as to its date. The nucleus that is thus extended is most shadowily historical. To understand these two orders of simpler ones, we shall have to turn to the critical study of the subtler myths.

II

CONSTANTINE AND BAPTISM

It is by the story of his baptism that Constantine came into the splendid fabric of mediaeval poetry. He does not live there with the bright life that metre can sometimes lend to men and things; because the authors of rhymed chronicles allowed themselves to stray, as a rule, only in small local touches from the prose originals they turned into verse. The author of the *Kaiserchronik*,[1] or Conrad of Würzburg in his *Silvester*,[2] would have had need of extraordinary metrical artifice to have made the alleged conference of the emperor and the pope with a company of Hebrew disputants trip with dancing feet—when the writer of the first poem takes from line 8590 to line 10,396 to recount the story and the second from 2695 to 5160. Yet there is a charm in these works that is like the quaint propinquities of mediaeval stained-glass windows. For in one of them 'patriarche unde kardinale' jostle the figures of Constantine and Silvester. Conrad is not guilty of such delightful

[1] Ed. Massmann, 1854. [2] Ed. Grimm, 1841.

anachronisms. He is a conscientious chronicler who keeps close to his original ; and still the same impression is made by his poem as by the *Kaiserchronik*, for that manner of his causes him to mingle twelfth century German with earlier Latin in the spirit of the window-makers :

> und sprach dô wider in alsus,
> nim zuo dir Felicissimum,
> und füere ouch Dyonisium, etc.

The respective manners of the two poets may be illustrated again by a point which will have to be given an almost predominant place in a critical discussion of the baptismal myth : that is the name of the mount to which Silvester flees in the time of persecution and to which Constantine goes bidden by a vision. The *Kaiserchronik* (10,596), of course, calls it ' Mendelberghe ' ; while the Würzburg poet assembles the various topography of his copy : ' Tarpêio ' (661) ; ' Kapitolîô ' (933 and 1185) ; ' Scîaptin ' (1283). The two poets are once more found true to themselves and the modes of poetic chroniclers in the Middle Age. It is true that Constantine would have had his place in the *Kaiserchronik* if there had been no Pope Silvester ; for he was an emperor. He would, however, have been as dull to read about as most of the imperial folk who figure in the old chronicle if there had been no place for him in the Church and among the figures in the subtly naïve creations of her early literature ; and Conrad

would have been without a subject to put into a measure that anticipates John Masefield. The historian can take pleasure in the sight of Constantine moving as another Charlemagne in the fascinating German lands of the time, which enshrine themselves in memories of old glass in Trier or engravings by Holbein ; and his business also is to ask how and why such mythical compulsions arose to put the emperor among the things no man could wisely forget. We must go from the poets to their sources.

Since Duchesne wrote his preface and notes to the *Liber Pontificalis*, which are his *Étude*[1] on another scale, the criticism of the chief literature that yields the myth has stood still where he stopped.[2] The basis for re-examination is in the eminent scholar's work ; thus a summary of his findings must be attempted.

Monsignor Duchesne brought light everywhere into the history and literature of, or dependent upon, the times of Pope Silvester, when he established the existence of what he termed 'les apocryphes symmachiens.' These were writings

[1] Duchesne, *Étude*, 165 ff.

[2] The studies by Dölger in *Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit*, 1913, 377 ff., and Coleman, *op. cit.* 152 ff., are examples of this later criticism. The chief change in them from Duchesne is where they date the writings of Moses of Choren, the Armenian historian, in accord with investigations made subsequent to the appearance of the *Liber Pontificalis*; Dölger (405 f.) and Coleman (155 f.).

produced during Silvester's reign to uphold him and his ideas. They produced the Silvester apocryphon which has been drawn upon by the earliest editor of the *Liber Pontificalis*, and in turn has given rise to the large Constantine-Silvester literature—perhaps the most endemic literary phenomenon in the history of Christianity from the fifth to the seventeenth centuries. Duchesne proceeds to notice the oldest literary references to the *Acta Sylvestri*. He concludes that Bede and Gregory of Tours, like the *Liber*, have drawn upon them. Older than either of these Western writers, as he claims, is the Armenian historian Moses of Choren. By careful analysis he showed that the *Acta Sylvestri* and the historian have either a common source or are derived from one another. Other evidence concerning the speech of the myth in the Near East—in the sermon by the Syrian bishop, James of Sarug, who lived from 452 to 521 A.D. ; in the writings of Leontius of Jerusalem [1] and John Malalas—is as early as the sixth century. That, as will be shown, is the earliest date which can be put to the Near Eastern evidence ; for the date of the Armenian historian has to be brought down to the seventh or eighth century : therefore, Duchesne's fourth century

[1] The inclusion of this writer in a Near Eastern list raises a little difficulty ; surely he ought not to be dissociated from Byzantium—see Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz* (Harnack and Gebhardt, *Texte*, iii. 1.), 1887, 223 ff.

link in his case for the anteriority of that Near Eastern over the Western evidence is destroyed, since he recognised that the use of Agathangelos in Moses of Choren concerned earlier Greek historians' record of the victories and not of the baptism of Constantine. The critical value for him of his conclusion from the above writings was that he could demonstrate how the baptismal legend arose in the Near East, and that Roman references which appear in the bulk of Constantine-Silvester literature are accretions due to a Westward spread of the myth. The chronological foundation for that opinion has been severely shaken by the discovery of the late date for Moses of Choren ; but there is another basis left which may be called the topographical.

The importance of the evidence for the name of the mountain in which Silvester goes to hide and Constantine to find cleansing could not have escaped the eye of Duchesne. We will summarise his treatment of the *Acta Sylvestri* and allied literature on this point. The Latin *Vita* edited by Surius leaves out the name of the mountain. The Greek *Vita* published by Combefis has Σοράκτιον—' mais c'est là une conjecture,' says Duchesne. From a study of the Greek manuscripts of the *Vitae* in the Bibliothèque Nationale, he found constantly the reading Σωραπινῷ ὄρει, sometimes Σαραπινῷ or Σαραπίωνι, but never Σορακτίῳ. The mediaeval *Passiones* have *Syraption* or

Syraptis or *Syrapti*. This last piece of evidence caused him to conclude that this must have been the original Latin form of the name. The Silvester notice in the *Liber Pontificalis* has in the printed texts before his own, the reading *Soracte*—'mais c'est là une correction d'éditeur.' The manuscripts of the *Liber* in Duchesne's class A have the reading *Syraptim*; whence it passed into the manuscripts of the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries. The manuscripts of class B constantly have the reading *Soracte*; the oldest representative of which is a seventh century fragment in the Royal Library at Naples—'ce qui montre que dès le septième siècle on avait corrigé l'orthographe primitive et identifié avec le Soracte la montagne Syraptim de la légende.' The exemplar of this class B is said to have been retouched far away from Rome. Duchesne regards these B manuscripts as having only secondary value for the text of the *Liber*. He is certain then that the original of the list of the popes had the reading *Syraptim*, and that it came directly from the primitive *Acta Sylvestri*. The Near Eastern evidence was almost silent on this point; for neither Leontius nor John Malalas mentioned the mountain, and the text of the sermon by the bishop of Sarug was unknown to him. The Armenian historian, however, in the eighteenth century edition [1]

[1] That is the edition by Whiston, *Mosis Chorenensis Historiae Armeniacae libri*, iii. Londini, 1736.

had *Syraptim* in both the Armenian text and Italian translation. Therefore, Duchesne concludes finally that the mount *Syraptim* was originally an oriental creation and that its eventual identification with *Soracte* was due to some fortuitous resemblance between the two names.

Another contributory argument for this Near Eastern origin of the name was found in the conference between the Jewish leaders and Silvester. Duchesne suggests that such a gathering could only have been imagined in a Mesopotamian region; for it is so much against the accepted notions of Graeco-Latin lands. Moreover, he believes that there are certain Nestorian or Theodorean tendencies in the Latin version of the conference which have been corrected in the Greek version, and these corrections have been followed by the Syriac translator. The one passage that Duchesne adduces will be discussed when the piece of Silvester literature in which it occurs is newly examined. We are obliged to recognise that this Christological point has its place in his view, that mountain and baptismal incident and filiated Constantine tales had their rise in the Near East and not in Rome.

It appears, then, that Monsignor Duchesne's argument for the origin of the name of the mount in which Silvester hid is determined finally by a consideration, from his classification of the manuscripts of the *Liber Pontificalis*, that the name

Soracte arose in the Silvester notice, as it did for the body of Silvester apocrypha, by editorial union in the seventh century of the name of the mount that had its place only on the spiritual map made by an imaginative Mesopotamian, with the actual name of the Roman mount that was nearest to it in sound. He has assumed also that the Greek *Vita Sylvestri* has recorded the veritable Greek form of the name of the mount. That is a Graecised form of the nominally fictitious Near Eastern form. It is not, for instance, a Greek translation of the name *Soracte*. It may be inferred that the belief is that such a translation form would be rather a transliteration form. Thus it is in a Hadrian document[1] with the date 787: ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σωράκτει. An earlier document which is the work of a most prominent Greek can give us what Hadrian's document cannot, the translation form for the name. About the year 593 Gregory the Great wrote his *Dialogues*, and in the opening[2] one he made reference to the monastery: 'quod in Soractis monte situm est.' Gregory has no thought of Silvester in mind, for he openly writes about the Abbot Nonnosus,[3] who ruled the monastery about the middle of the sixth century.[4] The use of the name

[1] Harduin, *Acta Conciliorum*, 1714, iv. 80 ff.

[2] *P.L.* lxxvii. 181*c*. [3] Cp. *Ep.*: iii. li, *P.L.* lxxvii. 646*b*.

[4] *Acta SS.* xli. 409 ff. (Sept. 2); throughout the documents here the form for the mount is Soracte. On the date of

here is purely and accurately geographical. Just over one hundred and fifty years after Gregory's pontificate, a Greek came to his throne: 'Zacharias, natione Grecus, ex patre Polichronis,' as the entry in the *Liber Pontificalis* says; and he translated the *Dialogues* into Greek.[1] How does he render the name of the mount? Zacharias translates[2] the phrase quoted in Latin as: τῆς ἐν τῷ Σεραφθὴν ὄρει. It is interesting to note that when Zacharias was at work upon the *Dialogues*, the monastery on *Soracte* became Silvester's. Mabillon gives the date as 747 on the authority of 'Chronicon Benedicti monachi Soractensis, saeculo decimo scriptum.'[3] A reference to that work discloses the assertion: 'Monasterium sancti Silvestri in montem Syrapti.' Mabillon in his name for the mount follows Gregory's form; Benedict follows Zacharias' form. The next pope but one to the Greek was Paul I. In a letter dated 762 is the sentence: 'Monasterium scilicet B. Silvestri Pontificis atque Confessoris situm in monte

Nonnosus, see also Mabillon: *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*, 1703, i. 170 *sub ann.* 577: 'de Nonnoso Soractensi.'

[1] *Lib. Pont.* i. 426 and 435.

[2] *P.L.* lxxvii. 182*c*. Grisar: *Festschrift Georg von Hertling*, 1913, 217, 1, conflates Gregory's Latin text when he makes the reference: 'Monasterium in summo montis [Socratis] calcumine situm'=*P.L.* 77, 181. The reference should be 184*a*. His study is a literary one in support of Duchesne's views.

[3] Pothast, *Wegweiser*, 1896, i. 144 gives Benedict's date as 1000. The citation is from his *Chronicon*, *P.L.* cxxxix, 31*a*.

Serapt.' Again the same name Serapt occurs in another letter with the date 767.[1] Thus with literal exactness we have the Latin form for that inaugurated by Zacharias. It has passed into the technique of the Papal chancery.[2] There is here a better explanation for the change that occurs in topographical nomenclature during the time of Zacharias, than Duchesne's, which says that the shift from *Soracte* to *Syrapti* was due to popular phonetics. Very quaint changes are brought about in place-names ; but the letters of the popes, with their traditions for usages, should not be the documents where these are to be found. Nor is it likely that Zacharias would have turned from Gregory's *Soracte* to write Σεραφθήν because peasants in the neighbourhood of the mountain were beginning to alter its name. And the Greek form that Zacharias had given to the supposed popular pronunciation of the name can scarcely be said to be creditable to the papal ear

[1] Cenni, *Mon. Dominationis Pontificae*, 1760, i. 194, 235. Jaffé, *Monumenta Carolina*, 1867, 98 reads *Seraptim* in the 762 letter.

[2] It is not without interest to notice that in the Anglo-Saxon translation of Gregory's *Dialogues* by Waerferth of Worcester (ed. Hecht, *Bibliothek der Angelsächischen Prosa*, 1900, v. 48) the name is rendered 'munte Soractis'; and in the Anglo-Norman French version by Angier (ed. Foerster, *Li Dialoge Gregoire lo Pape*, 1876, 29) 'el mont Soractis.' Angier was connected with St. Frideswide's monastery in Oxford, Cloran, *The Dialogues of Gregory the Great translated into Anglo-Norman French by Angier*, 1901, 2.

or eye. Pope Zacharias was a scholar, and would not have created an unusual form of the name. We are driven then to ask the question whether he is following an earlier Greek tradition for the name. If that is found to be so, then a series of questions will be opened up, such as, for instance : Is it true that the form *Syraptim* is a Near Eastern creation ? And is it not more exact to say that the form *Soracte* is older than *Syraptim* in the complex of Constantine-Silvester literature ? The discovery of answers to these questions may lead to the reconstruction of critical opinion upon the rise and growth of that literature. Thus, the form used by Zacharias for the name of the mountain is, in the first place, a palaeographical problem.

Contrary to the trend of criticism concerning the Constantine-Silvester literature, it is required that the problem raised by this name should be looked upon as one arising from a Roman original. Let us suppose that there was an ancient *Vita* that had its rise in Rome, and in which was an amalgamation of certain incidents about the emperor and others about Silvester. This document could have been written in a Roman cursive hand of the fourth or fifth or even the sixth century ; and the ' c ' of the mountain's name, which has become ' ϕ ' in Zacharias' translation of the *Dialogues*, would in that hand be very like the Greek letter.[1] The

[1] Cp. the description of cursive ' c ' in Van Hoesen, *Roman Cursive Writing*, 1915, 229.

temporal room that has been allowed for the date of this Roman document is in accord with the evidence. The letter-shapes which could lead to such a Greek form for the mountain's name are the problem. An examination of Latin papyri written in the sixth and seventh centuries exhibits just these palaeographical conditions that are sought. There is one, for instance, that is now kept in the Rylands Library at Manchester, which was written in Ravenna.[1] It is a deed of gift to the church of Ravenna from one Johannes, a captain of a company of soldiers.[2] Originally it was in the form of a long roll; and it has been dated variously from the end of the sixth to the seventh century,[3] or 'probably early in the seventh century.'[4] A study of the photographed portion of this document gives

[1] James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Latin Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library*, 1921, 1-3. A sketch of its travels from possessor to possessor is in Van Hoesen, *op. cit.*, 217. Reusen's *Eléments de Paléographie*, 1899, 26, says in error, 'conservé au British Museum à Londres.' He is also inclined to date it too late.

[2] Cp. description in *Palaeographical Society*, 1886, Series ii., Pt. iii., Pl. 51.

[3] Marini, *I Papiri Diplomatici*, 1805, 296. James follows him.

[4] *Pal. Soc.*, *ad loc.* Van Hoesen, *op. cit.*, catalogues two papyri with the phi-like form, that is examined in connection with Zacharias' rendering of the *Dialogues*, which do not appear to be Ravenna documents—viz., Nos. 119 and 120 (pp. 212 ff.), Table 6, 63-64, etc.

reason why a Greek on reading a *Vita Constantini-Sylvestri* in such a hand might read *phi* where the scribe had written 'c' followed by 't.' To have done so accounts, in the simplest manner, for the appearance of the *theta*, instead of a 't,' in Zacharias' rendering of the name Σεραφθήν. It has come in by phonetic necessity. Ravenna too was a likely place at about the time when this papyrus was written for interest in the doings of Constantine. For was she not then and after the Constantinople of Italy? The condition of the document under palaeographical examination is a witness to the fact with its commingled sections of Latin and Greek, and its Greek official titles. But what of its date? For the nearer settlement of that question, with its inclination to help our larger problem, it is suggested that the Greek section (iii. 38-49) deserves study. When it is compared with a Greek papyrus, dated 441 A.D., the harmony of the two as to their palaeographical characteristics is striking. Thompson[1] has described those of the Fayûm papyrus as being, for example, a d-shaped *delta*, an incipient minuscule *mu* and a large *kappa*; whilst to these can be added the leaf-like form of *rho* when it is preceded by *epsilon*. These characteristics are those of the Ravenna papyrus in its Greek portion. The date

[1] *Greek and Latin Palaeography*, 1912, 177, No. 37. Cp. James, *op. cit.* ii., Pl. i., for the Greek portion of the Ravenna document.

of this Greek hand cannot be much after that of the Fayûm document; since the only sign of Time's smoothing out of the earlier scribal roughnesses is to be found in the slight depression of the patently oblique top-stroke in the formation of *sigma*. These considerations from the Greek side of the Ravenna document ought to put back its dating to somewhere between the second half of the fifth and the first half of the sixth centuries. Mabillon,[1] by a series of chronological arguments which move round the name *Vitali Tabellioni* (i. 14) and his equivalisation of it with *Vitalis Forensis*, dates the Ravenna papyrus in the year 504. Marini objected to that solution; and favoured the date we have said. The objection to so early a dating on the foundation of the nominal equivalisation was right. But there is a safer ground for argument on the ground of palaeography for an earlier date than Marini's, and that he has neglected. It has already been set out. The use of the Greek name for the mount to which Silvester went is accounted for—viz., that he has rendered his form of the name from a Latin original of the *Vita Constantini-Sylvestri*; that this original had the name *Soracte*, and that it was written in a Roman cursive hand of a date between

[1] *De Re Diplomatica*, 1789, 477-480; Cp. *Giornale de' Letterate d' Italia*, 1713, 136 ff., where an Italian antiquary who does not sign his name, draws on Mabillon, but appears to favour about 560 as the proper date.

the second half of the fifth and the first half of the sixth centuries. The implications of this argument have now to be faced, these are : 1. that contrary to Duchesne's findings the name *Soracte* preceded that of *Syraptim* ; 2. that the latter, then, is not a piece of Oriental imagination but the consequence of a palaeographical mutation by Pope Zacharias ; 3. that the baptismal myth had its rise in Rome and not in Mesopotamia. This important change of the whole values in a critical estimate of the early Constantine-Silvester literature takes us to the question of how the myth arose.

A prior statement to these proofs, however, is wanted from the sides of Greek and Oriental literature. Does either present temporal difficulty against this explanation of the rise of the name ? Duchesne[1] has noted the chief Greek forms of the mountain's name : Σωρατῖνον or Σαρατῖνον. Ryssel,[2] in his study of the British Museum *Cod. Syr. Add.* 12174, which is a Silvester document, remarks that the Syriac form of the name is *Sarapantos* ; but in his translation of the text he uses the form *Sarapion*. This act of Graecisation is an old habit with translators of Silvester literature. Before him, Duchesne had been supplied with those forms from the Syriac : *Srapion* or

[1] I. cxix. 2.

[2] *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Litteraturen*, 1895, 28.

Sraption.[1] There is no shadow of doubt that the Syriac form has its origin in a Greek attempt to make a more Greek name from the Latin which issued in Pope Zacharias's palaeographical trimming of the earliest Latin name for the mountain where Silvester is said to have hidden. Thus the Syriac name is the creation of a kind of literal zigzag after this fashion : 1. Soracte [2] ; 2. Σεραφθή ; 3. Syraption ; 4. Sorapanṭos or Sraption or Srapion ; 5. Σωραπῖνον or Σαραπῖνον. The Syriac *Vita Sylvestri* instead of being a document that could give to the West an original legend of Constantine with an influential spelling of the name of Silvester's mountain, is rather the product of a Greek translation of the second or later Latin version of a Constantine-Silvester document—we may call the first form of that document the *Soracte* form, and the second the *Syraption* form. It is upon the Greek version of the latter that the Syriac translation has been made. Instead then of being of primary value for the Constantine-Silvester literary tradition, the Syriac version is of tertiary value ; for its contents will be found to have just the same value as its rendering of the name and the baptismal legend.

[1] Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, iii. 52 and 53.

[2] Tomassetti, *op. cit.*, 415 f., records a mediant form between 1 and 3 that arose in the eleventh century, *Siractis*—this form leads to Dante's in *Inferno*, xxxvii. 94 : *Siratti*. Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, 1716, ii. 95, in his notice of Petrus Aldobrandus, has the form 'monte Soraste.' That appears to be peculiar to him, and to have arisen by euphonic softening of the original 'k' sound.

The other Near Asian witness for the originality of the *Syraption* form of the Constantine-Silvester literature is Moses of Chorene. He seemed a sound witness for that claim when a fourth century date was ascribed to him. It has, however, been pointed out that since Macler subjected his writings to an illuminating examination that early date cannot stand. The French authority on Armenian literature says that Moses cannot have written ' before the first years of the eighth century.' The principal reason for this new opinion is the discovery that the source for the matter about Constantine in the History by Moses of Chorene was not in any Greek writer, but in an Armenian version of a *Vita Sylvestri*. This clears up the difficulty which hitherto has remained in the *History*, ii. 83, after the matter that avowedly had been taken from Agathangelos was recognised; since it is certain that there is no baptismal legend concerning Constantine in his book. Whence then came the story to Moses? A *Vita Sylvestri* acts as a prefatory document to the Armenian *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Socrates. The translation of this important historical work was made somewhere between 661 and 692: Açolik affirms the upper end of this date as being when the translation was made; whilst a subscription to the translation itself purporting to come from the author himself brings it down to the lower end. That the *Vita* and the *Historia*

were joined together in one book is known on the authority of Kirakos of Gandzak.[1] It will be seen then that Macler has abundant reasons for dating the *History* of Moses somewhere in the beginning of the eighth century. He has made out also a very convincing case for the fact that this Armenian translation of the *Vita Sylvestri* is based upon a Greek original. The many delicate textual affiliations demonstrate that as could no other means. Now the baptismal legend is here in the *Syraption* form. This shows that the mountain's name in what we have called the later or second Latin form of the Constantine-Silvester literature was transliterated into that Greek version of the literature which preceded those containing the name as Σωρατῖνον or Σαρατῖνον. The Greek version known in Armenia may have been a later one than that known in Syria ; since the Syrian witness in the person of Jacob of Sarug, belongs to the late fifth or early sixth century. It is in point to observe that there can be no Armenian colour in the name *Syraption* ; and that there is no trace of Armenian imagination in the baptismal legend.[2]

[1] Carrière, *Nouvelles Sources de Moïse de Khoren*, 1893, i. 18 ; Cp. Kirakos, *History of Armenia*, ii. (Brosset, *Deux Historiens Arméniens*, 1870, i. 6), where the historian associates Constantine and Silvester.

[2] The Greek Constantine-Silvester literature rather had its own creative influence in Armenian. This is seen, for instance, in the *Life of Gregory the Illuminator*—as it is recorded in Agathangelos, *History of the Reign of Trdat*, cxxvi. § 166, and

A Greek *Syraption* version of the Silvester material gave the legend to Armenia: was the same version known in Syria some three centuries

the anonymous *Lettera dell' Amicitia e dell' Unione di Constantino gran Cesare e di San Silvestro Sommo Pontifice, e di Tridade Rè dell' Armenia, e di S. Gregorio Illuminatore della Natione Armena scritta nell' Anno del Signore 316* (Pub. in Venetia, MDCXCV. Antonio Bortoli); and then in such works as Gravina, *Al Gran S. Gregorio Archivescovo e Primate dell' Armenia*, 1630, or Volpe, *Breve Narrazione della Vita, Martirii e Miracoli S. Gregorio*, 1636, or Vartabad Matthew, *Life and Times of S. Gregory the Illuminator*, 1749 (translated by Malan, 1868). The historian is clearly the earliest and least sophisticated literary witness of the alleged influence. He tells his story with less circumstance than the *Lettera* of Trdat's journey to Rome where he meets Constantine with the pontif the great archbishop Selpestros. Constantine enquires of him by what means he was cured of a certain bestial condition in which the Armenian monarch had been: Trdat ascribes his cure to Gregory the Illuminator. Constantine did reverence to Gregory, and showed such affection to Trdat that an alliance was made between Italy and Armenia. First of all, this cure of Trdat is interesting. Its interest can perhaps be best brought out by turning to the *Vita S. Gregorii Armeniensis, Legenda Suecana* (ed. Rietz and Lindall, 1843, v. 279). This early Swedish version tells us that Trdat became like a pig: 'i swina liknelse'; and adds, a little lower on the same page, that the animal is Apolline: 'af gudz mönster somhoet apollinis' or again 'af gudzsins apollinis mönstir gik Konungin.' Silvester has given place to Gregory, and Constantine's leprosy to Trdat's Apolline condition—here it is to be noted that perhaps the Armenian has kept an ancient note that has dropped out of the extant Constantine-Silvester literature, that Constantine's disease as it has been made was originally an Apolline cult condition; this will become clearer in our chapters dealing with the primary Roman form of the literature. The association of Constantine with Apollo-Helios accounts, I think, for the pig being made an

before? The Monophysite bishop of Sarug tells something of the myths of Constantine in the course of a homily. It is in the lyrical style of

Apolline animal in the *Vita Gregorii*; since it seems most likely that Apollo has displaced Zeus (*vide* Epimenides περὶ Μίνω; a fragment in Isho'dad of Mvre, *Commen. Acts of the Apostles*, c. xix. for pig in Cretan Zeus cult; or same animal in cult of Zeus Bouleus, Cook, *Zeus*, 1914, 668 ff.). Another lucid instance of the creative influence of this literature is seen in the *Lettera* (p. 17), wherein the dragon incident of the Capitol is recounted with Silvester and Gregory, and Trdat with the Constantinian sign overcame it. The gatherings of officials, etc., when Constantine and Trdat meet are modelled on the conference with the Jewish leaders in the Constantine-Silvester traditions. The date of the *Lettera* as being 316 is apocryphal. Brosset, *Rapports sur un Voyage Archéologique dans La Georgie et dans L'Arménie*, 1849, 45 ff., pointed out that the Armenian of this document manifests French influence. Gregory is said, for example, to have had a copy of the *Letter* from the 'Imperial Chamber' (dchambr). Brosset then suggests a date somewhere in the thirteenth century for its composition. Concerning French influence in the Armenian he could have gone further. I think there is such in some of the names of the alleged bearers of this *Lettera*. One of them is said to have the name *Nabot di Acolis*. Is not this a touch of Gallic playfulness? And the mediaeval French base of the name to be found in the two words *nabot*, a little man, and *asolex*, the thirteenth century form of the verb *assoiller*, to pardon or requite (Godfrey, *Dict.*, *s.v.*)? Certainly *Acolis* cannot be a place-name; cp. Ferrarius, *Lexicon Geog.*, 1670, *s.v.*: 'Acolis ubercula fuit in ins. Tenedo, in mare Aegeo.' There were some Tenedian churches and ecclesiastics (Gams, 449). But they are too early; and such topographical refinements are unnecessary to the *Lettera*. Upon the belief in these matters, which we have traced to the influence of Constantine-Silvester literature, as being historical in the sixteenth century see Samouelian, *Bekehrung Armeniens durch den heiligen Gregor Illuminator*, 1844, 139 and 196.

prose that won for him a name as a poet.[1] The two astonishing facts, arising from an examination of Jacob's statement, are these: he does not mention the name of Silvester nor the mountain to which he fled or to which Constantine went for baptism. The baptismal myth is given with much poetic detail: its mountain locale is omitted. A glimpse of Syrian retouching in its details is to be seen where he recounts that Babylonian or Chaldaean (p. 200) magicians advise Constantine to bathe in the blood of children. Another is in the placing of Constantine's baptism in the Lateran under the guise of mount Sinai. The contents of the bishop's homily constitute what has a right to be called the earliest Syrian tradition concerning Constantine. That it is based on a Roman version of the Constantine-Silvester material is certain. To have introduced the Sinai metaphor into the baptismal story means that a real topographical designation in keeping with the features of the bath of blood and the change to Christian baptism, was in the original story. The Lateran was before Sinai. That this Roman version would name Silvester's mountain *Soracte* is as sure, from the date of Jacob and that of the rise of the *Syraption* form, as that Silvester himself was in it. The Syrian version is wholly derivative; and is creative of no part of the Constantinian

[1] For a summary of the man and his work, *see* Duval, *La Littérature Syriaque*, 1907, 351 ff.

baptismal legend, except perhaps in the instance of the Lateran-Sinai equation. The same thing is done in certain mediaeval Arabian geographers.[1] This small feature, then, looks as if it is the only Near Asian contribution to that legend. Were this proved that dignity should be given to it, not merely because it appears in certain Syriac and Arabic writings, but also because it seems to have been known and to have exerted influence in Rome of the first half of the fifth century. The earlier recorders of Lateran inscriptions[2] record that among the inscriptions which adorned the ancient basilica is the following one :

> Aula Dei haec similis Synai sacra iura fuenti,
> Ut lex demonstrat, hic quae fuit edita quondam,
> Lex huic exiuit, mentes quae ducit ab imis,
> Et vulgata dedit lumen per climata secli.
>
> Flavius Constantinus Felix Victor Magister utriusque militiae patricius, et Consul ordinarius, et Padusia illustris foemina eius uxor uoti compotes de suo fecerunt.

This apsidal inscription can, of course, be dated with some exactitude. For there is the authority of Prosper of Aquitania[3] for the date of Flavius' patrician honour and his death : the first was in

[1] Guidi, *La descrizione di Roma nei geographi arabi*, 34.

[2] *E.g.* Rasponi, *De Basilica et Patriarchio Lateranensi*, 1656, 15 ; cf. De Rossi, *Inscps. Christ. Romae*, ii. 1, 149 and 306, or Rohault de Fleury, *Le Latran au Moyen Age*, 1877, 29 f. and 415 f.

[3] *Chronicon*, *P.L.* li. 594*c*-595*a* ; see also Johannes Antioch, *Fragmenta*, 201, 2 (ed. Müller, *F.H.G.* iv. 615).

428 and the second, by the hand of the deacon Grunitus, in 430—that is within the reign of Pope Caelestinus I. (422-432). We know that this pope was most interested in Silvester;[1] since he decorated the Silvester basilica in the Via Salaria with mural paintings, and was buried there. Evidently that interest had spread to governmental circles. Flavius shows that in the manner of either copying a Syrian version of the Constantine tales or perpetuating a contemporary Roman version. His short tenure of office marks the year 429 as that in which the inscription was raised. Jacob of Sarug could not have delivered his sermon before the end of the fifth century. That is to say, there is at least sixty years between the inscription and the sermon. During those years Rome was much concerned with the Near East. Theology as often as commerce made then continuous coming and going between Italy and Syria. Therefore it is right to conclude that even the Sinai metaphor was born in Rome and not in Syria; and that most probably it sprang there from the Eusebian picture of Constantine which made Moses to be a factor in his spiritual ancestry. The Syrian imagination, like the Armenian use of Constantine material, has left no mark on the baptismal legend. Nor can there be any temporal barrier from the Near Asian versions of the Con-

[1] Mansi, xiii. 801, citing Hadrian's letter to the second Nicaean synod.

stantine-Silvester literature against the date we have found, in the time of Pope Zacharias, for the invasion of that literature with certain dominating features of nomenclature. We have now to discover the grounds for the Roman originality of the *Soracte* version of the story of Constantine's baptism.

Even a cursory reading of the Constantine-Silvester literature must lead to the conclusion that there is small explanatory power in that which accounts for its rise in this simple fashion : Constantine and Silvester were contemporaries, therefore the intrusion of the emperor into an early *Vita Sylvestri* explains that literature. The literary material is too complex to admit of that simple explanation of its origins. It may be recalled how, for instance, therein are juxtaposed the mountain Soracte and the Tarpeian rock, the bath of blood and Christological disputation, a Dragon myth and Constantine's alleged suffering from leprosy. A knowledge of the literature will support the view that these strange contrasts or juxtapositions are not made by dislocating it, but that it is composed of a complex of heterogeneous material. Since the criticism of Duchesne that impression of its contents has been accepted. An analysis to find its component parts, or the primary literary motives which created the literature, can alone yield an interpretation that will explain the chief actors and their varied stage.

How came Constantine and Silvester to be found in a Sabine setting? What kind of cartographical influence caused *Soracte* and *Tarpeia* to become neighbouring heights? And whence is the fiction of Constantine's leprosy and the prescribed baptism in the blood of children? This particular gathering of literary factors, as we have said concerning another mode of explanation, is not to be understood by allowing the Constantine-Silvester legends to have the naïve grace of heterogeneity that is usually thought to belong to the Lives of the saints. For as soon as analysis begins its work upon them, their lodes of ancient cult significance begin to disclose themselves. Before Silvester was those cults were. His connections with *Soracte* did not occur before the early Middle Age; Constantine was at home with old cults from the first to his last days. We may find then that we have to consider an altogether new feature in the criticism of this literature—that is a *Vita Constantini* which is antecedent to the *Vita Sylvestri*. To climb mountains often very lonely paths have to be taken; and to reach emperors and popes often the most unlikely means of approach open upon the imperial or papal throne; therefore our best way to these is to go down that we may rise, to descend first of all into the Dragon's Hole.

Our text for analysis will be supplied from the Lipomannus and Surius[1] *Vita S. Sylvestri* and the

[1] *De Vitis Sanctorum*, 1581, 337*a*.

dragon incident in *Legenda sancti silvestri pape ab eusebio cesariensi palestino greco sermone compilata.*[1] The necessary passage from the Lipomannus-Surius *Vita* is as follows:

> Draco maximus habitabat in *profunda spelunca* (A) juxta montem, qui ab eis nominatus fuerat Tarpeius, in quo etiam collocatum Capitolium. Et autem draconi quotoquoque mense alimenta ab eis large suppeditabantur: quae quidam praestigiatores cum virginibus incantatricibus assumentes, in illam *speluncam* (A) per multos gradus descendebant, et in ea execranda peragentis mysteria, in quibus nulla insignis deerat abominatio, illic cibis relictis, reuertebantur. Certis autem temporibus draco repento ascendens, foras quidem non egrediebatur: sed jacens in ingressu cauernae, *uenenato anhelitu corrumpebat aerem* (B), ex quo mors afferebatur uicinis, *magis autem imminebat interitus infantibus* (C).

The story goes on to tell how Silvester overcame the monster, and 'multi', says the text, were

[1] The copy I am using is in the British Museum Library (1B3885) contemporaneously bound with five other fifteenth century books. 1. Samuel Marochitanus, *Tractatus Contra Judaeos* 'sermone arabico translatus,' cp. *P.L.* cxlix. 337 ff. 2. Athanasius, *Contra hereticos Sabellium, Fotinum et Arcium*, cp. *P.G.* xxviii 95 ff. 3. A nameless *Dialogus Christiani contra Sarracenum*, cp. Joann. Damascenus, *P.G.* xclvi. 1335 ff., Theodorus Abucura, xclvii. 1461 ff., an anonymous writer, cliv. 1151 ff. 4. Johannes Turrecremata, *Tractatus contra principales errores*, etc. Anno 1465. 5. Prosper *Contra objectiones*, cp. *P.L.* li. 177 ff. The reason for binding the alleged Eusebian writing with these is to be found in its long 'Controversy with the Jews.'

baptised because of the deed. The *Legenda* version has much the same outline, but is Constantine-Silvester in its action: the *Vita* version has nothing in it of the emperor. In this second version an appeal is made to Constantine against the dragon—' propulsus vester romanus draconis invictissimi periclitur (B) afflater' (fol. 20*a*). The emperor co-operates with the pope in a story that follows the course of that in the *Vita*. After solemn discourse and procession, they reach the abode of the dragon: ' Tunc draco immanissime *squamas* (D) faciem ex ore et sibilationes horridas' (fol. 20*b*). The overthrow of the monster is even more complete than when done by Silvester. Since 23,000 men are baptised, ' et nullam penitus flatus' concludes the *Legenda* version, ' draconis apparuit ex illa die et deinceps (B).' We need trouble with no other details of the legend in these two versions; except to remark that in the *Vita* it precedes the legends of the baptism of Constantine and the Convocation of the Jews, but in the *Legenda* it follows that gathering. As a Silvester story, it occurs almost at the beginning of his *Vita*; as a Constantine it comes almost at the end of the *Legenda*. An ascent from this noisome place to the mountain heights of our texts is to be made by means of Servius.[1] That great commentator on Virgil has this passage

[1] *Comm. in Virg. Aen.* xi. 785 (ed. Thilo and Hagen, 1884, ii. 564).

which is altogether precious for the commentator on the Constantine-Silvester literature. Servius says :

> *Sancti custos Soractis Apollo* Soractis mons est Hirpinorum in Flaminia conlocatus. in hoc autem monte cum aliquando Diti patri sacrum persolveretur—nam diis manibus consecratus est—subito venientes lupi exta de igni rapuerunt. quos cum diu pastores sequerentur, *delati sunt ad quandam speluncam ; halitum ex se pestiferum emittentem, adeo ut iuxta stantes necaret* : et exinde est orta pestilentia, quia fuerant lupos secuti. de qua responsum est, posse eam sedari, si lupos imitarentur, id est rapto viverent. quod postquam factum est, dicti sunt ipsi populi Hirpi Sorani : nam lupi Sabinorum lingua vocantur Hirpi.

This striking passage about the *Soracte* cult is a perfect parallel, especially where it is underlined, for the two points italicised, A and B, in the passages from the *Vita* and the *Legenda*. The dragon's hole and his poisonous breath are in Servius set in a *Soracte* mountainscape. Have we come upon more than fortuitous literary concurrences ? For in Servius we have a wolf instead of the dragon ; Dis Pater instead of Apollo and no sign of the Tarpeian rock. Let us take first the easiest point of these three. Servius is commenting on a Virgilian line that states the reality of the Apollo of Soracte. The commentator is recording the displacement of the Sabine god by Dis Pater. He knows all about this particular, as his comment on *Aen.* XI. 762 shows. Moreover the presence

of the wolf in the Servian comment is indicative of the older god in this mountain shrine. And again, when comparing these parallels, we have to remember that Sabine things, if such they are, have been removed from *Soracte* to the neighbourhood of the Tarpeian rock. Such a general consideration as this last sentence contains, however, does not tell us why the wolf has given place to the dragon or whence the Constantinian leprosy had come. These mutations are as integral to the baptismal and associated legends as is the factor of the bath of blood.

For the transference of the cult of the Soractean Apollo from the Sabine country to the Capitoline hill—that is to the neighbourhood of the Tarpeian rock—already there is a good evidence. The celebrated Forum *cippus* will be recalled with its inscription whose first line refers to *Soranus*,[1] the special Sabine appellative of Apollo on mount *Soracte*. The site of its discovery, and its indubitable reference to this Apollo, leaves no sort of doubt that Soractean and Tarpeian cult matters are, for this stage of their religious history, one and the same. Especially will this be appreciated

[1] Dessau, *Inscps. Lat. Selectae*, ii. 1, 4913, who quotes Comparetti's emendation, *Sord.* Rather should we read *Sora*, Milani, *Rendiconti della Reale Accad. dei Lincei*, 1900, 300; Thurneysen, *Rheinisches Museum*, 1901, 163, who cites Studniczka as holding the same opinion; Otto in Pauly-Wissowa *sub Hirpi-Sorani*, viii. ii. 1935; Taylor, *Local Cults in Etruria*, 1923, 86, who cites Bormann's opinion to the same end.

when we have completed our demonstration concerning the Constantinian document that is the base of the Constantine-Silvester literature; for then the last fear goes as to the presence of Sabine cults in our topographical context. So many reasons can be shown why the veritable Constantine must be put back into the framework of a Romanised form or development of the cult of Apollo Soranus if he is to become a more actual figure than at present he is; and each of them contributes to the establishment of the certainty that the Italic god came from *Soracte* to the holy place of Roman worship. Mutations do presuppose originals to be mutated. Where these can be exhibited in process of formation, from original cult values to mutation of these values, such evidence is confirmative of both stages of the cult. The Servian parallel to the A and B features in the *Vita Sylvestri* and the *Legenda* is a most apposite illustration of this matter. It should not be thought that these exquisite harmonies for site and horrors have set us a problem of inexquisite disharmony in zoology in the change from the wolf to the dragon. Nor indeed have we to scan the existing evidence for a regular Soranian cult development of that theriomorphic kind. Nothing of the sort seems to be known. What, however, we may look for is that the Romanisation of the Sabine Apollo—the evidence for which is now being disclosed for the first time—

will mean that some Roman accretions will have been made to the Sabine original, and that these account for the change in the horrific animal.

Among the more secure facts in the evidence for Constantine is his worship of the Sun. His panegyrists have told us that as well as his imperial critic Julian.[1] The Byzantine writers [2] also preserve the evidence of his erection, in his new capital city, of a statue of Apollo-Sol with which he identified himself. As early as Philostorgius [3] occurs the evidence for this deed that keeps a steady place almost down to the close of the great days of Byzantine literature. There are again the numerous coins,[4] that cover the greatest part of Constantine's reign, with their Sun symbols and epithets to confirm the literary evidence with their tangible and ocular powers. These last display that what he set up for worship in Constantinople he had worshipped in Rome. Just so does the

[1] *Orat.* iv. (ed. Hertlein, 1875, 170), *Orat.* vii. (296).

[2] *E.g.* Socrates, *H.E.* i. 17; Zonaras, *H.E.* xiii. 3; Nicephorus Callistus, *H.E.* vii. 49. Other Byzantine writers in the *Corpus Byz.*—Codenus, 41; Anna Comnena, ii. 155; Sathas, 187; Glykas, 617; Theophanes, 222. Again, such writers as George Hamartolus (ed. Muralt), 400; Constantine the Rhodian (ed. Legrand, *see infra*, c. vii.); Tzetzes, *Chiliades*, viii. 329 ff. The most complete collection of authorities is in Preger, *Hermes*, 1901, 457 ff. It supersedes that of Du Fresne or Unger.

[3] *H.E.* ii. 17 (ed. Bidez, 1913, 28), cp. citation from a Greek *Vita Constantini* in *Cod. Angelic. Gr.* 22 (Bidez, 20).

[4] Maurice, *Numismatique Constantinienne*, 1908, 1911, i. and ii, especially the second volume.

primal *Vita Constantini* that has been despoiled to enliven the *Vita Sylvestri*, but with a record of cult filiations impossible to coins. When the Sabine Apollo was brought to the Capitoline hill he was Romanised by means of adding to him solar qualities. The wolf connotations and rites were preserved, but given a new embodiment and turn of expression in the dragon—the animal of the Sun. To measure if there is the little less or more of Mithraism in the Constantine evidence for the developed Sabine cult would not lead us to any safe or accurate conclusion. Whatever the origins of the Roman Sun cult may have been, the mind of Constantine is best realised by reminding ourselves of two fragments from Ennius [1] where he sings :

> Sol, qui candentem in caelo sublimat facem ;

and again :

> Iuppiter tuque adeo summe Sol, qui res omnis spicis,
> quique maria terram caelum contines tuo lumine.

Little could be gained for our knowledge of Constantine's thought by attempting to see if there is a literary foundation for those lines in Euripides.[2] *Sol* has become at home in the Roman mind ; and a Roman emperor must be allowed to speak the religious idiom of Rome. It

[1] Müller, *Q. Enni Carminum Reliquiae*, 1884, 118, lines 289 and 292 f.

[2] Cp. Cicero, *De Fin.* 1, 2, 4.

is quite clear that Constantine was not satisfied to use a Sabine dialect of religion : his ' dragon ' for its ' wolf ' proves that point. For the same reason there is no service done to evidence or mode of investigation by trying Roman tongues with a vocabulary from Near Asia which they cannot speak.

The simplest way, therefore, to a complete judgement is to take into account the fact that the dragon as a Sun animal was best known to the Romans through the story of Medea. She plays no part in the basal *Vita Constantini* : she is a poetic or legendary bearer to Rome [1] of some ways and speech of the cult of the Sun which can interpret certain phases of the cult matter in that *Vita*. From the time of Ennius, in whose house of life Homer was said to have resided, on to Seneca and Dracontius the cult tale was told in Latin literature, and with something like the same manner. This is so, at least where a detail of great importance for our investigations is concerned—that is the dragon-chariot of the Sun. When Seneca [2] wrote of it, he said :

Squamosa gemina colla serpentes iugo ;

[1] Cp. the representations of the Medea story on third century Roman sarcophagi, Robert, *Die Antiken Sarkophag-Reliefs*, 1890, ii. 212 ff., and especially Taf. lxii. six specimens ; lxiii. 2 ; lxiv. 2 ; lxv. 2. For a fresh discussion of the Greek Medea material, see Cook, *Zeus*, i. 244 ff.

[2] *Medea*, 1023.

and Dracontius [1] :

> uenere dracones Uiperea ceruice iubas et colla tenentes *Squamea.*

the Ennius fragments inform us that the dragon was in his poem on Medea :

> non commemore quod draconis saevum sopivi impetum,

and that the word italicised in the Seneca and Dracontius citations was in his vocabulary, as his poem on Andromeda evinces :

> scroepeo investita saxo, adque ostilis *squamae* scaprent.

It is most likely that he is the exemplar of the Medean convention for the chariot or animal of the Sun in Roman literature that treated of the solar cult. The literary parallel marked D in our citation from the *Legenda* coincides with the above Medean citations. This ' scaly ' word means more for us than the repetition of an ancient convention in description. It was made into a primary architectural factor of the legend this chapter discusses. At the opening of the account of the baptismal legend where Constantine is being advised to undergo baptism in blood, the *Legenda* describes this complaint with the one word ' lepre ' (fol. 3*b*). When the emperor is approaching Christian baptism, and after the same account has inwoven the Biblical analogue of Naaman,

[1] *Medea*, x. 556-7.

his complaint is said to be 'leprem elefantie' (fol. 5*b*). These two touches in the incident mark with refined discrimination the effects of two literary sources on the creation of the legend. The simple word 'lepre,' in its old cult context, is Latin transliteration from the first Greek version of the Constantine-Silvester literature. The Greek word in that version was the translation of the description of the animal of the Sun, the dragon: since the Greek word λέπρα, *i.e.* 'scaly-skin,' here is a translation of the dragon's 'squama' or 'squamens' or 'squamosus,' which was in the original Latin *Vita Constantini*—that document whence the *Soracte* cult matter passed into the later Constantine literature. A characteristic of Sol's dragon was made into a disease for Constantine. The natural sort of skin that a dragon would have became the diseased sort of skin from which Silvester ought to cleanse the emperor. Once more we can ascertain from the *Legenda* that a Greek version of the story is in use: his second phrase: 'leprem elefantie' bears another mark of what is perhaps Greek transliteration. It is true that Pliny[1] in two places has the same collocation: 'in lepris, elephantiasi,' and a second time with the terms in the reverse order: 'elephantiasi albae, lepris.' But Pliny describes two sorts of scabby disease; whilst the compiler of the *Legenda* is repeating

[1] *N.H.* xviii. 9 (33), 127, xxv. 5 (24), 60.

the same thing. Evidently he had tried to give a pathological look to this feat of making a disease from dragon's scales by using in his narrative this term for 'scabs.'[1] For we can be sure of the conditions of the Greek version upon which the compiler is dependent.

Let us turn for a moment from the cult side of our narrative to its analogical side which is based upon the Scriptures. The narrative of 2 Kings v. that tells the Naaman story lends no help to the compiler as concerns our linguistic problems—the verbal origin of Constantine's leprosy; since the Greek says λέπρα and the Latin 'leprosus.' The second analogue, that has not yet been mentioned is taken from the biography of Paul. After the vision, on the way to Damascus, the apostle suffered from a sort of blindness; and when he was cured there fell from his eyes λεπίδες or *squamae*[2] as the two versions of the Acts say. The narrative of the Acts, then, lends its verbal chrism to the biographer of Silvester for the word-born disease from which Constantine should be delivered by the baptismal chrism at the hands of the pope. His inspiration for using this passage

[1] Hesychius, *s.v.* shows the synonymity of the two terms.

[2] *Acts*, ix. 18. We may remind ourselves here that the fat of the wolf was used as a sure preventive against ophthalmia (Pliny, *N.H.* xxviii. 37), and its baser products against cataract and dimming sight (Pliny, xxviii. 47). Primitive medicine may thus have had some part in the composition of our Dragon-Wolf narrative.

from the life of Paul would in all probability be Eusebius.[1] Thus an excellent literary ancestry in Naaman, Paul and Eusebius could be made out to cover his work as a creator of Constantinian history. Once more, it is necessary to remark, that such things could only be done on the foundation of a primitive Roman document about Constantine. The wolf of the Soractean Apollo completes one and a half transformations in the Constantine-Silvester literature—he becomes the dragon of Sol and in part the leprosy of a legendary Roman emperor. That half-transformation was a potent accomplishment ; since thereby the Romanised Sabine cult material became integral to the legend which has gone through the world even to our own day.[2]

Its integrity is to be shown by the origins of that strange feature in the myth, the baptism in the blood of children. A return to that illuminating passage from Servius reminds us that the priests of the Soractean cult were called *Hirpi Sorani*, which is Sabine for 'Soranian Wolves.' The other details of his comment explain their functions. First, there is the fact of a cult for shepherds who protected the primitive pastoral settle-

[1] *Vita Const.* ii. 1 (ed. Heikel, 1902, 40). Note the propinquity of the ὄφις to the interwoven use of *Acts* ix.

[2] Cp. Dölger, *Die Taufe Konstantins und ihre Probleme*, 1913, 376 ff., in *Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit, Festgabe zum Konstantins-Jubiläum*, 1913.

ment from wolves ; second, that they who did this were set apart as or simulated or took the names of ' Wolves '—Servius' phrase ' si lupos imitarentur ' may include the three meanings. That a wolf-god, or the wolf-hypostasis of an ancient god, lay behind these ritual doings is meant by Strabo [1] when he remarks on the Ἱρπῖνοι that they are so named because they are followers of the Wolf. On the stage of evidence where we are working, it is clear that we have to do with a wolf-hypostasis which passed over into a dragon-hypostasis on Roman soil. There was an early stage of Roman religion, and Mars was a god of pastoral life,[2] when the wolf became one of his animals.[3] Our evidence as to what was the result of this assumption is, of course, later than that stage. Here the god is emerging as the protector of an organised society. Hence in times of danger the produce of the earth and ' pueros ac puellas innocentes ' [4] were vowed to him. These children were not sacrificed, but kept till of adult age and then sent to find a new place of settlement. A fragment from the lost

[1] *Geog.* v. 4, 12. Cp. the Umbrian names in *C.I.L.* xi. 5626, *Hirpi*; 5627, *Hirpio*; 6246*a* or *Hirpidius*.

[2] Henzen, *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, 1874, 26 ; Ovid. *Fasti*, iii. Varro, *Ling. Lat.* vi. 45 ; Festus *s.v.* Mamuri ; Joannes Lydus, *De Mens.* iv. 49.

[3] Virgil, *Aen.* ix. 556 ; Livy, x. 27, 9 ; Horace, *Carmen*, i. 17, 9.

[4] Festus (Paulus) *s.v.* Ver sacrum (ed. Lindsay, 1913, 519). For the entering into these rites of military connotations, and so of Mars as a god of war, see *Livy*, xxii. 10.

Historia[1] by Sisenna puts these facts back into their Sabine setting: 'quondam Sabini feruntur vovisse, si res communis melioribus locis constitisset, se ver sacrum facturos.' This excises the note of danger that grew quite naturally into one of military necessity, and maintains the values of the rite of *ver sacrum* on its earlier social scale. Mars can be now omitted from our argument. It is a fair inference that much more that was anciently Sabine religion passed into old Rome than has as yet been recognised. Moreover this document embedded in the Constantine-Silvester literature, and which we are studying, can give us the name of the Roman god unto whom these Sabine things were grafted, and we shall see that this name was not Mars. What, however, should be clearer to the mind even than these last reflections is that we have discovered the cult parallel to the one marked C in the citation from the *Vita Sylvestri*—that of the place of children in the Constantine myth. Therein, children are said to provide blood for the baptism of the emperor; or, in the alternative form it is upon children that the noxious breath of the dragon works most harm. The first form was produced by making cruder the Sabine practice of the sequestration of children in their Wolf rites: the Greek Christian redactor of the earliest Latin *Vita Constantini* must be held responsible for this since the pagan baptism of blood is the patent

[1] iv. (99), in Nonius Marcellus, *s.v.* Ver sacrum (p. 840).

antithesis of the Christian baptism of water. The second form arose as a natural extension of the tradition, as preserved by Servius, that pestilence came among the *Hirpi Sorani* from the Wolf's Den—the 'wolflings,' for such the children were in these rites, would undergo the same experiences as the Wolves.[1] This was only a pagan tale-teller's way of explaining why both vowed men and children lived a life hidden from the Sabine, and later the Roman, community. The plain consequence of our discoveries to this point is that the Christian baptism by water has no more historical value than this: it was a piece of literary antithesis to the imagined pagan baptism by blood.

We must now turn from the depths to the heights, from holes in mountains to the mountains themselves, if we are to find how and why such mountains and men could have been brought together as in our literature—how Soracte came into the locality of the Capitoline hill,[2] and Constantine was joined with Silvester. Did the primal *Vita Constantini* show marks of the influence of Pro-

[1] For other evidence concerning these ritual matters, see c. iii. The alleged 'fire-rite' in this phase of Sabine religion (cp. Servius, *Aen.* xi. 787), does not arise for discussion from our evidence; nor do the speculations of Mannhardt, *Wald- und Feldkulte*, 1905, ii. 318 ff., and Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 1915, xi. 14 f., who accept the equation of Feronia and the Soracte rites.

[2] Virgil, *Aen.* viii. 347, identifies the two 'montes'; Varro, *Ling. Lat.* v. 41.

pertius? That elegant poet knew,[1] it will be remembered, something of the Sabine legends of the Tarpeian rock. This comes out, not in the story of the love of Tarpeia for the Sabine King Tatius, but in such phrases as 'Tarpeium nemus' and 'Silvani ramosa domus.' The first of Propertius' phrases gives the rock in its right setting; whilst the second is as yet an intruder upon the scene of our investigations. When to that latter phrase is added, for instance, a cluster of inscriptions and a line from Tibullus, we may claim that this unexpected god has rights to find himself in the Romanised Sabine setting our discoveries have laid bare. On the inscriptions this god has an interesting appellative, or rather double-name, *Silvano et Silvestris* or *Silvano Silvester* or *Silvestribus*;[2] and the poet musically says: 'Garrula Silvestri fistula sacra deo.' With that name this early Roman god is not only native to this Romano-Sabine scene; he is as well the bridge between the basal Latin account of Constantine and his pagan doings and the Greek christianised version of these facts. A Roman god with the name *Silvester* in a Latin narrative that put together Tarpeia and Soracte would be a very broad bridge for the agile writer to cross who brought together Constantine

[1] Propertius, v. iiii. 1 and 5.

[2] *C.I.L.* iii. 12367, 4306, 4442; cp. iii. 1153 and 10847, and Peter in *Roscher Lex.* iv. 871; together with the article *Silvanus* in Darembourg-Saglio *Dict.*, where it treats of the doubling of the name.

and Pope Silvester. Let us select several chief reasons why that god should have been there to tempt him to his achievement. A fragment from the *Saturae* of Lucilius, preserved by the assiduous Nonius Marcellus,[1] gives Silvanus this title: 'luporum exactorem'—if we follow Gerlach's[2] reading that certainly is demanded by the latest archaeological evidence we have for this god. In the tiny country of the Falerii, who supplied the priestly succession of the *Hirpi Sorani*,[3] was found a bottomless marble vase, through which most probably libations were poured,[4] dedicated to Silvanus. On its sides are figures in relief. One of these is a divine figure brandishing a *lituus* to keep off a wolf whilst in his left hand he grasps the horns of a goat. Paribeni's[5] short study on this remarkable object leads to the main conclusions: that the god depicted, and named in the inscrip-

[1] *De Compendiosa Doctrina*, xxvi. (74), ed. Lindsay, 1903, i. 158, who unfortunately, I think, has read 'lucorum exauctorem.'

[2] *C. Lucilii Saturarum Reliquiae*, 1846, 52; Müller's ed., 1872, 86, put 'lutrarum' into his text and 'luporum *cdd.*' into his footnotes, an unhappy inversion; Lachmann's ed., 1876, 62, read 'lucorum' in his text and cited Nonius Marcellus in his footnote as reading 'luporum,' and here the lexicographer should have been allowed to rule.

[3] Pliny, *N.H.* vii. 19.

[4] Taylor, *op. cit.* 95, 127.

[5] *Bullettino d'Arte del Ministero della P. Istruzione*, 1913, 165 ff. Cp. Héron de Villefosse, *Bulletin de la Soc. Nat. des Antiquaires de la France*, 1912, 335 ff.

tion, is the embodiment of what were the priests of the primitive Palatine cult, that is ' Keepers of the wolves ' : that, of course, is what Lucilius said of Silvanus. This Palatine variant of the primitive Capitoline cult can make its contribution to our knowledge of the latter, and by its use with our fresh cult evidence will in turn gain knowledge of itself. Paribeni's interpretation is in agreement with the most interesting investigations of Dübner concerning the *Luperci*. Now this scholar revived the earlier etymology for that term which said it was a compound of *lupus* and *arcere* ; therefore its meaning was ' Keeper off of wolves.' Then taking the evidence of Plutarch in his *Vita Romuli* he analysed the Palatine cult down to its base and two chief accretive phases. The base was the practice of the pastoral community where shepherds were told off to keep the wolves from the flock by running round the base of the hill as in a magical circle. The first accretive phase came about by the addition of Faunus rites. Hence the Plutarchean narrative represents the *Luperci* clad in goat-skins. This Dübner suggests was done to invigorate them with the spilt life of their goat-victims that they might the better fight the wolves. The second accretive phase is also to be found in the biography of Romulus ; for the *Luperci* use strips of goat-skin with which to strike women for the purpose of fertility, and these in turn are ritual instruments of the goddess

Juno.[1] A high authority on Roman religion has said[2] that if Dübner's conclusions are correct as to the basic practices in the *Luperci* cult, then there was no need for any god at all, nor any place for the notion of a 'quasi-dramatic representation of wolves as vegetation spirits,' according to Mannhardt. This second matter does not concern us: the first does. For deep in the roots of the Sabine Wolf cult there is the divine Wolf. The miming of wolves on the part of shepherd-ministrants is in keeping with all our knowledge of Mediterranean religion where the god or goddess demanded theriomorphic epiphany and hypostasis. When later recounters of these early cult matters talk of dens that stink[3] they have but realistically passed on a natural concomitant of the wolf to those who became ritual wolves—just as the imagined smells of a dragon's den were passed over to the site of Sol-worship and his dragon embodiment in our Constantine evidence. The Sabine base and its reliefs demonstrate that the Palatine

[1] Dübner, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 1910, 481 ff.; see also Wide: *Pomerium och Pelargikon: En Religionshistorisk-topografisk Undersökning*, 1911, 9.

[2] Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 1911, 478 f.

[3] Is this noxious smell a literary recollection of the sacrifice once made to wolves? A *Scholium* to Demosthenes, xxiv. 114 (ed. Dindorf, *ad loc.*), tells how Apollo kept off the wolves from Athens by means of the smell of sacrifice. Cp. the comment in Frazer, *Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild*, 1912, ii. 284.

practices were variants of Soractean rites on the Capitoline hill. The Silvanus there is becoming a Faunus; hence there he is also a pictorial affirmer in part of Dübner's first accretive conclusion, for it would appear that the vase suggests that the developing stage of the Wolf cult was still to be understood in terms of 'keeping off the wolves,' only that goat connotations were beginning to come into it.[1] The Palatine variant not only helps us to grasp the Wolf background in our Capitoline[2] evidence, it as well definitely preserves the simulation of sacrifice in those who were set apart as Wolves; for Plutarch[3] tells us the

[1] Is the name *Lupercus* (Justin, xliii. 1, 7) a cult translation of the Sabine name *Soranus*? An animal form is meant by it and not the sun. Tambroni, *Stud. Glott. Ital.* 1903, 222 f., suggests that it stands for *Smintheus*, and Moulton in Frazer, *Balder the Beautiful*, ii. 15, suggests ὗρεξ 'a shrew mouse'—Cp. Herbig, *C.I. Etrusc*, 73. But this is an endeavour to see only Greek or Creto-Greek in the Apolline name. Cp. Greek evidence for a Wolf sacrifice to Apollo, *Scholium* to Sophocles *Elek.* 6, and Farnell, *Greek Cults*, iv. 115. Or after all should we take the suggestion of the early Swedish translation of *Vita S. Gregorii*, that was so strongly influenced by the *Vita Silvestri* and find that Apollo's animal was the pig; then we might compare Buchlein's suggestion that the Umbrian word in the Iguvian Tables, *sorser*, means in its first syllable, 'pig' (cp. Bücheler's *Umbrica*, 1883, 39, and Conway, *The Italic Dialects*, 1897, i. 421, ii. 657).

[2] On the subject of the identification of the Tarpeia with the Capitoline, see Pais, *Saxum Tarpeium, Osservazioni Topografiche e Giuridiche*, 1900, 6 f.

[3] *Vita Romuli*, 21.

foreheads of the young were touched with blood. The case for the presence of the god *Silvester* in the primary Latin document concerning Constantine need not be laboured any longer. His presence there is demanded by the bearing of all our findings. Just as the orology of the myth of Constantine's baptism demands the creative influence of the Soractean cult, and the details of the Dragon rites are explainable solely by the inherent Wolf rites; so also the phenomena of personal nomenclature—those strange juxtapositions of the names of emperor and pope—became explicable only when they are viewed as caused by the Christianisation of names which were in the document that described the Soractean cult domiciled in Rome, and the baptism of Constantine by water from leprosy is alone to be understood when we remember the scaly dragon of Sol and the alleged rites of blood in his and the older Wolf cult.

A Note Appended to this Chapter on Analysis of the Chief Literary Witnesses for the Baptismal Legend.

It is difficult to analyse what almost eludes analysis. For few of these chief witnesses cared to exert any critical sense in the reception or use of their material. Even those who did look into the things which were said about Constantine, find that something external, rather than internal, to the evidence forces them to cast doubt on this or that feature. The refinements of criticism have

arisen in this way. Therefore, we ought perhaps to require little or no more than the results of such external stimuli. It would have been most helpful to us, however, if our witnesses could have yielded some clearly defined lines of descent. Tradition does not exercise itself in the care for minutiae of evidence. The broad effects make impression. Hence, when we come to examine the many witnesses for the baptismal legend, we feel that Döllinger's book, *Die Papste Fabeln des Mittelalters*, 1863, 52 ff., and its method in his chapter on that myth are vindicated. That great scholar pours out his learning on this matter in a very indiscriminate way. We have already found reasons for that indiscrimination. And yet it may be helpful if we classify the witnesses according to any classification that is natural to them. Our first duty will be to note: 1. *The Beginnings of Criticism.* Under this head are two witnesses. Ekkehard Urangiensis (*Annales Magdeburgenses*; ed. Pertz, *M.G. Script.* xvi.), who in 1100 began to express some caution as to the traditional accounts of Constantine's relations with the Christian religion—*sub ann.* 320. Beyond that his notion of the war with Licinius is fantastic. The source of his account of the vision of the Sign—*sub ann.* 311—looks like a conflation of Rufinus and the Neo-Lactantian source *De Persec.* With Nicholas of Cues (*De Concordantia Catholica*, iii. 2; Schardius, *Syntagma Tractatuum de Imperiali Jurisdictione*, 1609, 357 f.) criticism reaches a singular and high point in the Middle Age. He cites Vincentius Bellovac. *Hist.*, as he calls it—that is, the *Bibliotheca Mundi*, lib. xiii. (ed. 1624, 540), as we know it. The biographer of Nicholas is not quite exact where he makes the cardinal's critical treatment to rest chiefly on silence, like

Isidore Hisp., Fredegarius and Gregory of Tours (Vanstenberghe, *Le Cardinal Nicolas de Cues*, 1920, 28). Vincent is not his sole source. Both the names for the Sabine mount, *Soracte* and *Serapti*, occur in his statement. That suggests more than one source. The *Serapti* tradition comes from his explicit use of the *Gesta Sylvestri*; and the *Soracte* usage from Hugo Floriacensis (*Chronicon*, ed. Rottendorff, 1638, 93). This does not mean that Nicholas could preconceive the lines of modern criticism. It simply tells us that he had several sources, one of which had a touch of the *Soracte* usage. The faint start of the destruction of the baptismal legend is also in his statement. From *the beginnings of criticism*, then, we proceed to the witnesses for: 2. *The Soracte Tradition*: Ordericus Vitalis (*Hist. Eccl.* I. ii. xxiv.; *P.L.* clxxxviii. 205 f.), Sicard Cremonensis (*Chronicon, sub ann.* cccx.; ed. Muratori, *Rerum Ital. Script.* 1723, vii. 553); Hadrian (Harduin, *Acta Concil.* 1774, iv. 80 ff.). To be set over against those writers are the few who explicitly state: 3. *The Syrapti Tradition*: Romualdus (*Chronicon*, ed. Muratori, *op. cit.* vii. 78 ff.); Ptolemæus Lucensis, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. (ed. Muratori, *op. cit.* xi. 823). Our next series is of those who asserted: 4. *The Nicomedian Tradition*, that is to say, the baptism of Constantine at the hands of Eusebius of Nicomedia: Isidore Hisp., *Chronicon*, 96 (*P.L.* lxxxiii. 1049 *a*); Fredegarius, *Chronicarum*, ii. 420 (ed. Krusch, *M.G. Script. Rerum Meroving.* ii. 66); Hermann Contractus, *Chronicon, sub ann.* 334-336 (*P.L.* cxliii. 79)—the two versions of the *Chronicon* in codices *Augiensis* and *Bernoldi* practically coincide to maintain the Arian tradition of Constantine's baptism; Otto Freisingensis, *Chronicon*, iv. vi. (ed. Hofmeister, 1912, 192) ex-

presses this view filiated with Rufinus, x. 12-13. Arising from the tradition is : 5. *The Tradition of Rebaptism,* Godfrey Viterbiensis, *Pantheon* (ed. Muratori, *op. cit.* vii. 359), who doubts that Constantine was a leper ; follows *Hist. Trip.* and believes in Roman baptism, but declares rebaptism by Eusebius 'fuisse narratur' : Martinus Polonus, *Cronica, sub ann.* 311 (ed. Klimes, 1859, 41 f.), who expresses himself strongly against the theory that Constantine was converted to Arianism. Our next category must be : 6. *The Orthodox Tradition :* Freculfus, *Chronicon,* iii. xvi. ff. (*P.L.,* cvi. 1194 ff.) follows Eusebius in Rufinus' ed., Sozomen and Socrates ; he, however, appears to express no definite judgement ; Ado Viennensis, *Chronicon,* vi. (*P.L.,* cxxiii. 91 *d*) ; Beda, *Chronicon, sub ann.* 416 (ed. Mommsen, *Cronica Min. Saec.* iv., etc., 295, a notice in most respects like Ado's ; Bonizo, *Liber ad Amiciem,* ii. (*P.L.* cl. 806 *b*), who includes a strong polemical statement against Arianism without mentioning Eusebius of Nicomedia —perhaps the tradition of Arian baptism was known to him ; Marianus Scotus, *Chronicon,* iii., *sub ann.* 328 (*P.L.* cxlvii. 698 *b*), Jerome is given as his authority for the Licinius incidents in Constantine's life (cp. Ordericus Vitalis, *H.E.* i. iii. xxi. ; *P.L.* clxxxviii. 302 *b*) ; Leo IX., *Ep.* i. xii. ff. (Harduin, *Acta Concil.* vi. 933 ff.), the standard Lateran view of the emperor's baptism ; Albericus, *Chronicon, sub ann.* CCCXVII. (ed. Leibnitz, 1703, 25). Our final category represents an associated order of tradition : 7. *The Constantinian Example :* Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* ii. xxxi. (*P.L.* lxxi. 226 f.), who narrates the baptism of Chlodovech and calls him 'novus Constantinus' by moralising the baptism from leprosy. Hincmar, *Vita Remigii,* xxxix. (*P.L.* cxxv. 1160 *c*),

who, writing of the baptism of the son of Clotilde, calls him by the same name as Gregory called Chlodovech, and with the same moralisation of the baptism. These seven divisions arise naturally from the chief witnesses to the baptismal legend. The late Byzantine writers play so large a part in the text of this book, and their evidence on this matter really brings no light, that they have not been set under their respective orders of tradition.

III

CONSTANTINE AND ANTHOUSA

It is always difficult to assess the values in interest of the various portions of the *De Mensibus* by John the Lydian ; for investigators will be sure that where he supplies them with material, there is the section of highest interest : therefore, without any faltering, the portion of his book that matters most at present must be said to be that in which he tells how Romulus (Constantine) named his new imperial city, parenthetically how the *lituus* came to his hand, and what were the means he used in the plotting out and founding of the city. His narrative splits itself into these three divisions without violence of fracture, an accommodation which will be taken advantage of in this way : the parenthesis will be utilised in the discussion of the Constantinian symbol and the latter portion of John's tradition where the legends of the foundation are dealt with—thus now we are occupied with that first portion which gives the title to this chapter. There the Lydian[1] tells us how on the eleventh of the Kalends

[1] *De Mensibus*, iv. 50-51 (ed. Bekker, 1837, 85 f.).

of May Romulus convoked a grand assembly in Rome, how taking upon himself the augurship, he proclaimed the several names of his city—the initiate, the hieratic and the political names. These were severally : Ἔρως, or as the poet Virgil called her, Amaryllis ; Φλῶρα or Ἄνθουσα ; and thirdly, Rome. Passing over the second portion of John's statement, we reach its last sentence where Constantine is allowed to come into view fully, and not as one who takes refuge behind Romulus, and find it saying : 'Rome and Constantinople were called Φλῶρα, that is, Ἄνθουσα.' Lest it be thought that liberties have been taken with the text of the *De Mensibus* and with Constantine by looking at the whole of his Anthousa statement in the light of his last sentence, it is necessary at the outset to assemble other literary evidence.

Joannes Malalas,[1] recounting the various foundations of Constantine in his new city, remarks in passing that its primary name was *Anthousa*, because of a bloodless sacrifice made to the god bearing that name. The *Paschal Chronicle*[2] has the same entry almost word for word. This was to be expected since the earlier Byzantine chronicler is one of its chief sources.[3] Eustathius[4] says more

[1] *Chron.* xiii. v. 5 (ed. Niebuhr, 1831, 320).

[2] *Ad ann.* 328 (ed. Dindorf, 1823, 528).

[3] Cp. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, 1880, i. 228 ff. etc.

[4] *Comm. ad Dion. Perieg.* 803 (Müller, *Geog. Graeci Minores*, 1861, ii. 357).

simply that Constantine called the city Anthousa; whilst Stephen the Byzantine[1] either intrudes a reference concerning this same name, or an interpolator has done so for him, in a notice about Greek cities that are built about the sacred fig-tree.[2] Two reasons seem sufficient for the belief that the reference may have come from Stephen's pen; and hence that his text here is in an imperfect condition. The first reason is that it was a district near Constantinople, or as he says *New Rome,* which inspired his geographical notice; therefore it would be an expected thing that Stephen should make such a reference. For, secondly, his text as it stands shows that the endeavour was to bring it into line with the tree-names he catalogues; and above all it has to be remembered that the *Fig-tree* is another great cult feature of the *Luperci* tradition. Whether the work of Stephen himself or of an interpolator, the same point is made as in Joannes Malalas; though here with an allusion to the fig-tree that is another cult feature in the old Palatine Wolf-cult. The descent of this material is easy to trace. Malalas draws from Lydus; the compiler of the *Paschal Chronicle* from Malalas. Eustathius undoubtedly depends on Lydus; and so also does the interpolator,

[1] *Ethnicorum, s.v.* Συκαί (ed. Meineke, 1849, 590 f.); Strabo, vii. 6 (320).

[2] Cp. Pais, *Ancient Legends of Roman History,* 1906, 57. 51.

shall we say,[1] of Stephen the Byzantine.[2] Then for the early evidence on Anthousa there is one source, and that is in the *De Mensibus* of John the Lydian. One of the lesser Latin geographers, Julius Honorius, may be added to the above gathering, whose *Cosmographia*[3] has two recensions. That called *A* by its editor reads 'Byzantium oppidum'; and that called *B*, 'Byzantium; haec Anthusa Constantinopolis dicitur,' where the geographer makes reference to Constantine's town. There is surely no reason to trace for Honorius any other source than the sole fount for early writers. This conclusion does not mean that John has imposed his narrative on the earlier centuries of this era. He is drawing on sources older than himself; and these will carry us back to that literary and cult context in which we have already found Constantine.

There is one other feature of this evidence as it appears in those who depend on Lydus; that is, in three cases the writers have troubled to add gloss-like touches to their borrowings which explain that they understood the cult source repre-

[1] Cp. the intruded reference to *Syke* in Justinian that follows the opening sentence in Stephen (Krüger's ed. *Code*, i. ii. 18; 1888, 16). For other references to this district, see Socrates, *H.E.* ii. xxxviii. (*P.G.* lxvii. 328 *b*), Sozomen, *H.E.* iv. xx. (*P.G.* lxvii. 1174 *c* and 1176 *a*).

[2] Cp. Dodwell in *Geographiae Veteris Scriptores Graeci Minores*, 1712, iv. 30 f.

[3] 32; ed. Riese, *Geographi Latini Minores*, 1878, 42.

sented in the Lydian writer's statement. Joannes Malalas, and after him the Paschal Chronicler, inwove the phrase that a 'bloodless sacrifice was made called Anthousa'; and then, as we have seen, the so-called interpolator of Stephen the Byzantine gives that name its early Palatine ritual meaning, that is, he puts it with the sacred fig-tree. These two gloss-like touches give the name its profoundest and oldest religious connexions: they put it back, or the cult features it represents, into the context of the cult of the Wolf. When then it was declared above that Lydus had put Constantine into commerce with Romulus, the conjunction turns out to be one in fact and not one due to modern literary jointure. The Lydian had drawn his knowledge from a source where the religion of the Wolf that became Sol's dragon [1] was known.

We must again return to the text of his book to note how this Romulus-Constantine section is fitted together. The description already given stands in need of two small but significant additions. Besides the parts concerned with the name of the city, the *lituus* and the mode of planning the city, there occur two sentences which have no evident relations with those three preceding features and none with the succeeding which declares the *Anthousa* name of Constantinople. Niebuhr has printed the first of them in an isolated

[1] For Apollo and dragon, see, *e.g.*, Aelian, *De Nat. Animalium*, xi. 2 (ed. Hercher, 1864, 270).

way as a sort of pendant sentence to iv. 50 thus : Ἰλιὰ ἡ τοῦ Ῥωμύλου μήτηρ. A reference to the text of Lydus manifests that the parentage of Romulus has not been in question either before or after that dislocate genealogical statement. The sentence with which the next section of Lydus' book opens (iv. 51) is even more surprising with its intrusive look : ἐκ μὲν τῆς ὁποιασοῦν πρὸς ἔνια τῶν ξύλων παρατρίψεως κόρεις γίνονται, ἐκ δὲ παντὸς οὔρου ψύλλαι μυῖαι δὲ ἐξ ἀποπάτου ἢ καὶ ἄλλης θερμασίας.[1] Has a bit from an ancient writer on hygiene strayed into the text ? Or is it a vagrant formula from Folk-medicine ? For more certain than the isolated condition of the statement about Ilia is the incorrelate nature of this second sentence. The simple genealogy that goes before it and the equally simple topographical statement that follows it have no possible filaments, as they stand in the text of *De Mensibus,* to link them with such foreign matter. We can be very sure that the sentence is native to the text ; since, for instance, when we turn to John's sources it is proved to be essential to his notice of Romulus who passes over into Constantine.

There are three well-known authorities for the tales about Romulus : Dionysius of Halikarnas-

[1] Niebuhr, *ad loc.*, renders the sentence : ' Ex quovis ad nonnulla ligna affrictu cimices fiunt, ex omni urina pellices, muscae vero ex alvo aliove tepore.' Wünsch, ed. 1898, 126, edits an enlarged context for this sentence.

sus,[1] Livy[2] and Plutarch.[3] These three record, with a wealth of actors who do not come into the scope of this investigation, the myth of the sonship of Romulus to Ilia. She was a part-divine being; our authorities agree to call her *Rhea Silvia* or Rhea. Her story pierces back into the radical motives of the oldest cults on the Alban hill.[4] From these we must, however, avert our attention to remark the fact that the story in Dionysius—and he is to be preferred before Livy, because he had drawn upon the chief older Roman historians and Livy himself,[5]—tells how Rhea Silvia is condemned to death because the god had made her his bride. But *Anthos*, the daughter of her condemner, pleads for her release from death; and they are both sent into imprisonment, whilst the boys Romulus and Remus are exposed by the Alban shepherds where the Tiber bathes the foot of the Palatine hill. There a she-wolf saves them from death by suckling them. Through this mother they are reared to found the hill-city and to maintain the Alban line of kings.

[1] *Antiq. Romanorum*, i. 76 ff., for there our interest in Dionysius' Romulus material begins.

[2] *Hist.* i. 3-11. [3] *Vita Romuli passim.*

[4] Cook, *Zeus*, i. 677, 4; see also c. viii. 89.

[5] 1. lxxviii. 4. I agree with Pais, *Ancient Legends*, 285, that Livy was one of Dionysius' sources against the opposite and accepted view for which Niese, *Grundriss der Römischen Geschichte*, 1923, 17 ff., etc., is responsible.

The legend is thus reduced to skeleton-form ; or rather to those essentials which we have found that the earliest cult conditions demand. Our analysis brings out the *Anthousa* name in a shortened or masculine form, though in the mythographers that name is given to a woman. She calls for special attention. Our task is to show, first of all, how this analysis of the Ilia story harmonises with that in Lydus. At the first glance in no sense at all, seems to be the bounden answer : one strain of the myth is talking of loves and births and the Wolf cult, and the other of a new city with triple names and a Constantinian equation of these things. Put thus, there is great difficulty in seeing any likeness between the two traditions. The Lydian must have had his own manner of building up paragraphs of his *De Mensibus*—the pendulant entries in his book declare that fact. He must have had a bigger and more precise context present to his mind than sometimes appears in his text. His Romulus-Constantine entry is an excellent illustration of this point. For, though Wünsch has improved on Bekker's edition of the Lydian's book, he has not been able to make the Ilia reference in this portion of it less dislocate than the earlier edition—by printing it as the last sentence of the paragraph referring to Romulus ; instead of printing it, as Bekker did, in isolation. In Wünsch's mode, the editor may be thought to be saying : that the entry has connexions somewhat

with the whole ; and in Bekker's mode that it is problematically isolate. Their meanings cannot be far apart ; for the sentence is unrelated as it occurs in the text. We have already found that this Ilia reference is a way across the gulf between the explicit references, in Lydus, to Romulus and Constantine ; and that *Anthos* is the maker of the way. Are there other constituents in the Lydian's statement to render that way firmer between Romulus and Constantine ? An answer to the *Anthousa* problem will be found as we are able to answer this question.

The two names for Rome, the initiate and the hieratic, are in apposition in *De Mensibus*. Eros and Amaryllida, and Flora or *Anthousa* form what in Near Asian poetry is called a parallelism. They do not say the same things over again in different language : they intrinsically educe the significations of one another. Lydus gives us his source for the initiate's name. But Virgil said other than he has been made to say. The first *Eclogue* could not have fitted to its most exquisite music : ' formosam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas,' a piece of guide-book or commentatorial speech. It is actually the latter, as Servius shows. When this most serviceable scholar comments on *Ecl.* i. 5,[1] he apostrophises Virgil as ' composing a song to celebrate the city of Rome ' ; or again on i. 29, where the names Amaryllis and Galatea occur in

[1] Thilo and Hagen, iii. i. 5 and 9.

contrast, he remarks that this is an allegorical usage, ' for Galatea is Mantua and Amaryllis Rome.' Not for the first time have the commentators found esoteric and unthought of meanings in Virgil. This tradition, then, the Lydian followed; and gave it a place in his version of the Romulus legend. The natural motive for such a literary deed is to be found in the earlier Romulus tales in which Anthos found her place. Eros and Amaryllida have displaced the older pair, the god and Rhea Silvia. Lydus had the *Anthousa* tradition for Rome and Constantinople as a fixed point in tradition: the fluid matter in the Romulus-Constantine stories was for him in the other chief names; and its fluidity was caused by the new attractive interpretative glosses in the Virgilian loveliness about Rome and human love and the old Roman Folk-life. He brought his version of the Romulus myth up to date with the help of Servius or a commentator of the Servian school. The personal contribution to this revised treatment may be in his nicely ordered and docketed three names. The second member of the parallelism in this statement of the first two sorts of names for Rome was, then, the creator of the first member: the presence of the name *Anthousa* brought into place the commentatorial variant on ' the god and Rhea Silvia,' [1]

[1] On the endeavour to find personal and other references in *Eclogue* i., see *e.g.* Witte, *Der Bukoliker Vergil*, 1922, 20. 1, who wants to see Virgil in Menalcas (*Ecl.* iii.), rather than in

We may dismiss the Lydian scale of names for Rome as having only a curious literary basis. It did not exist in historical fact.

This fixed point, as we have called it, of *Anthousa* has the power to bring back the right perspective and creative details into the Romulus-Constantine material in Lydus. That power can be increased by examining it and its Latin equivalent. John says that Anthousa is the same as Flora. The latter name is, of course, a transliteration from the Latin. How has he come to put these names side by side? Are there radical rights, either in religion or history, why they should be so placed? The attempts of interpreters in mediaeval and modern times have brought no solution. Politianus,[1] for instance, under the spell of brightly solving the meaning of the name Florence, proposed this theory: Rome had three names: its own the vulgar; Amaryllida the secret; and Flora the hieratic—'de quo vocabulum Floralibus impositum'—and he proceeds to show the same meanings for Florence and Constantine's city. Politianus evidently knows both Lydus and Eus-

Tityrus because the latter is old and a slave and the first is young! It seems a pity to treat such poetry in this embalmer's manner.

[1] *Virorum Illust. Epistolae*, 1644, ed. Amsterdam, 5—*Ep. Lib.* i. 2 (*Petro Medice suo*); on this passage, see also Bernays, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1885, ii. 331 ff. Bonifacio, *Historia Ludicra*, 1656, Lib. xiii. iv. (p. 377), and Fabricius, *Bibliographia Antiquaria*, 1760, vi. ii. 215, cite Politianus and his views.

tathius; and neither of them can be held responsible for his interpretation of the name in the terms of the Floralia. The date of the notice in *De Mensibus* is against it, for example; and so is the Romulus context in which the name occurs. It will be shown that this religious sanction for the name will not hold good. Modern scholars have tried to find some historic foundation for the name in certain edictal phrases: Burckhardt[1] in the phrase 'eterno nomine,' and Strzygowski[2] in another 'urbs florentissima.' The first of these essays would give historic value to the triple name for Rome, found in the commentators; the second evidently considers that an historic name has been built into a superlative adjective by the writer of a Constantinian edict. The two investigators have transferred these alleged Roman facts to Constantine's new city; on the ground, it must be supposed, that what had been done and said in old Rome ought to be repeated in *Nova Roma*.[3] These three representative interpretations justify the letter of Lydus and cause Constantine to be a

[1] *Die Zeit Constantin's des Grossen*, 1880, 414; *Cod. Theod.* xiii. 5.

[2] *Analecta Graeciensia*, 1893, 143.

[3] Strzygowski, *op. cit.*, seems to desire to harden *Nova Roma* into an actual Constantinian name for the city. There is no more evidence for this now than in the time of Pius II., *Historia de Europa* (*Opera*, 1571, 394), iii.: 'Nomen urbi nouam Romam imperator indidit.' Cp. Julian imp. *Orat.* i. 8 *b* (ed. Hertlein, 1875, 9): πόλιν τε ἐπώνυμον.

mimetic Romulus. They do not disclose why such names as Anthousa and Flora are in the cult complex that lies behind the narrative of the Lydian writer.

Anthousa is there, as we have seen, because she is a figure in the ancient traditions concerning Romulus, or rather about the cult of the Wolf. Therein, Anthos is the form of her name. A valuable comment on this Greek name is in Pliny,[1] who on ancient authority says that it was the name of a clan who chose one of their number, and sent him out into the desert as a *wolf* for nine years ; whence he comes back into the ordinary estate of a man if he shall not have attacked men during his wolfhood. Pliny causes his Latin and Greek authorities for these things to subserve ' the tradition derived from Arcadian writings,' as he says. Anthos for him represents a factor in an ancient Arcadian cult. The parallels between the Sabine and the Arcadian wolf-cults cannot be missed. That they are superficial likenesses is an argument which cannot be entertained in the light of ancient evidence and modern archaeological research [2] on the subject of the coming of

[1] *N.H.* viii. 81 ff. ; cp. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, xviii. 17, who gives Varro as a source. Cook, *op. cit.* i. 71 ff., proves that Pliny is also drawing upon Varro. His analysis of the evidence is most illuminating—a characteristic of his great book.

[2] See summary, *e.g.* Robert, Pauly-Wissowa, vi. 1, *sub Euandros.*

Arcadian religion into the ancient Italic lands.[1] Our Romanised Sabine evidence has preserved a note of contrast with the invading Arcadian which is even more eloquent of their radical union than any of the parables. It will be remembered that in the rites clustered about this name *Anthousa* it is said that the ceremonial is bloodless. If we continue our reading of the passage cited from Pliny, we find him going on to quote Scopas' *Olympionicae*, that in the rites of the Arcadian Zeus Lycaeus—that is Zeus the Wolf—the man who went from among his fellows was made a Wolf because he tasted the flesh of a human victim offered to the god. It is possible that these succeeding paragraphs in Pliny refer to the same cult; and thus there was human sacrifice in Arcadia.[2] The Romanised Sabine tradition says that in it *Anthos* or *Anthousa* had nothing to do with the shedding of blood. Varro's evidence looks in the same direction; for he tells us that one of the requirements laid down for the turning again from wolf to man was that no human flesh was to be eaten during the nine years of wolfhood. The Palatine cult with its essential conception of 'keeping off the wolves' would appear to uphold

[1] *E.g.* Varro, *De Grammatica* (ed. Goetz and Schöll, 1910, 200), *Frag.* 45, *De Ling. Lat.* v. 53 (p. 17); Joannes Lydus, *De Magistratibus* (ed. Wünsch, 1903, 11), i. 5.

[2] On this form of sacrifice and Zeus Lycaeus, see Cook, *op. cit.* i. 70 ff.

that view; whilst its simulated sacrifice might look back to an earlier dreadful rite. The primal Arcadian values are what they are: the Sabine evaluation of them, and the Roman use of that orientation, exhibits an *Anthos* or *Anthousa* speaking and doing according to an Italic vocabulary of religion. Herein is that sort of contrast which declares identity of derivation.

There is another radical and direct relationship to be found between the Arcadian and Sabine traditions. Strabo[1] tells of an *Anthos* who was sent out of Troizen and as a result founded Halikarnassus: that is to say, here is evidence of a going out from a primitive society for the purpose of founding another. Stephen the Byzantine[2] records the fact that the *Antheadai*, the priestly descendants of Anthos, were the guardians of an ancient vegetation-cult in the Carian city: that is to say, here is evidence for the bloodless phase of the Zeus Lycaeus worship.[3] The settlement on Carian soil has maintained the gentler ways related with fields and woods, together with some of the Wolf connotation in the fact of compulsory migration. These big significations are, as we have shown, embedded in the primary strata of the

[1] *Geog.* vii. 15 (375).

[2] *Ethnicorum*, s.v. Ἀθῆναι. Cp. Boeckh, *C.I.G.* ii. 2655 and his comments, p. 450; also Schirmer, *Roscher Lexicon*, i. 367.

[3] Cook, *loc. cit.* has established these two phases, Wolf (blood) and Vegetation (bloodless) in the Zeus ritual.

Sabine religion, but with some differences. They represent Soracte, and Soracte Capitolised, as being nearer to the original lines of the Wolf cult than the Halikarnassian variant.

Our foregoing analysis of the Sabine and Romano-Sabine evidence has displayed its innate Wolf connotations. For we are about to prove that the *Anthousa* tradition came into the Constantine literature as part of the first Roman *Vita Constantini*, as it has been called, with its unquestionably Sabine background.

Varro [1] informs us that one of the Sabine goddesses was named *Flora*. A Sabine inscription [2] has the word *Flusare* which Breal [3] renders *Florali*, or 'Flora's month.' In a neighbouring Oscan inscription these two necessary components to our exposition are found: 1. a parallel to the Sabine term showing that then the worship of Flora went on; [4] 2. the name of the goddess *Flora* in the Oscan dative singular, *Flussai*. Thus, a principal conclusion is inevitable that in a *Vita Constantini* with a Sabine background there was the goddess *Flora*, and she is the base for the Greek *Anthousa* in Lydus. To draw such a conclusion is

[1] *De Ling. Lat.* v. 10 (p. 24).

[2] Zvetaief, *Inscps. Italiae Infer. Dialecticae*, 1886, 9 and 108.

[3] *Revue Archéol.* 1876, 301, who compares the Sabine inscription from Furfo 'mense flusare.'

[4] Cp. Breal, *Mémoires de la Soc. de Linguistique de Paris*, 1878, 141; Zvetaief, 33 and 109.

to raise a problem that would have been most difficult to answer if it had not been that help is afforded from the confused calendrical accounts of the Latin Floralia—that problem is whether *Flora* ever had any connexions with a Wolf cult. Those confusions have been dealt with long ago by Fowler [1] in his own masterly manner. Our concern must lie with a problem or two remaining in a portion of the fascinating *Fasti* of Ovid.

Where the poet asks questions there the problems are. He has no sense of their secular quality even though in the opening part of his poem he has made Cretan, Sabine and late Roman traditions concerning Wolf and Goat cults jostle one another in a way that is poetry, but is not history. In the course of this poem Ovid tells of April rites connected with the cult of Flora ; and reaching the description of the closing days of the ludi, he turns to ask the goddess why certain things are done and what they mean :

> 'Cur tibi pro Libycis clauduntur rete leaenis
> Imbelles capreae sollicitusque lepus ?
> Non sibi, respondit, silvas cessisse, sed hortos
> Arvaque pugnaci non adeunda ferae.' [2]

Three suggestions arise at once on reading those lines : Ovid is troubled by the shifting of a wood and mountain-land cult into a city or horticultural

[1] *Roman Festivals*, 91 ff. [2] *Fasti*, v. 371 ff.

setting ; that he is working on a literary account of rites older than those he knew anything about ; and that instead of the goddess he is the answerer of his own questions. The second and third of those suggestions could be made about much of the material in the *Fasti*. Ancient calendars ; accumulations of variant myths and contemporaneous ritual interpretations would, of course, set more problems for Ovid to answer than yield him solutions to go into lucid verse. The first suggestion is of another sort. It arises from the conditions of his text at this place—from the poet's ' rete ' and his ' lepus.' He must surely have been thinking of his ' hortos,' and proceeded to create hares and goats that were nice enough to run there and to return to their ' hutch ' or ' pen ' or ' net.' At least the under-sense of these words, in the light of the answer put on the lips of Flora, is that they have displaced fiercer animals. He recognises that the goddess has not the companion animals of her woodland state. The word ' rete,' and the sort of poetic connotations now suggested for it, should be looked upon as the last stage of the literary depravation of the *Anthos* myths. The next stage back is in the Greek authorities, like Plutarch.[1] Anthos and Rhea Silvia are put into custody : the she-wolves of the cult they represent are romanticised into a story, ready for the pen of an Anatole France to embroider, and that sequestra-

[1] *Vita Romuli*, iii. 6.

tion from a primitive society for the purposes of a new settlement becomes an act of formal imprisonment for an act of fornication. If Fabius Pictor and Diocles could get as far away from first meanings as that, there is no reason for wonder that Ovid should trim his account of the cult as a gardener the harmonies of his flower-beds, or perhaps should describe a contemporaneous practice in the late Floralia instead of viewing Flora as the Sabines saw her. Ovid was naïve enough to leave in the goats though he made the 'lupus' into 'lepus.'[1] This is the restoration of a word in his source; it is not an emendation of his text. Fowler's judgment appears to be just to the Ovidian statement of the cult: 'Flora as a goddess of fertility and bloom could love nothing in common with fierce carnivora.' The old Italic goddess, whose name Lydus renders as *Anthousa*, had her life in common with the Wolves that gave birth to the Soractean cult and its Roman variants on the Capitoline and Palatine hills; the first as the men of the Wolf-god kept the settlement free from lupine depredation, so the women of Flora prosecuted the fertility rites of the settlement. Not many folds of Time's filmy mantle about the

[1] In Latin Folk-medicine when a 'lupus' was not available a 'Wolf-spider' was used for various nervous complaints, see Renel, *Cultes Militaires de Rome, Les Enseignes*, 1903, 89. Cp. also how Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* viii. 18, ix. 52 rings changes on the two words.

first meanings of a cult in new territory are required to produce hares from wolves and a bacchanal of prostitutes[1] from the settlement of women with fertility significations. The Wolf and Flora from Soracte became in Rome the dragon of Sol and a Flora who clearly is in a Romulus-Constantine context. She is the same and yet a new creation. She will be and do in a Romano-Sabine style. This John the Lydian tells us in a most compact manner ; and her profound interpenetration of the Romulus legend will become plainer when we examine into the myth of the plotting-out of Constantinople. For the present, it is enough to realise in the vivid manner that the evidence allows what are the reasons why an *Anthousa* reference should be found in a Romulus complex and in a *Vita Constantini* ; that her discovery there manifests again the predominantly Sabine nature of the cult connexions in which this goddess, Romulus, and the emperor find themselves ; that the background of Dragon-cult on the Capitoline is the Sabine Wolf-cult from Soracte ; and that this is the big harmonising faculty of the *Vita Constantini*. It could not be otherwise if it is true that Constantine mimed Romulus ; for the wolf that suckled the founder of Rome had Sabine blood in her veins. She comes out of those cult

[1] Cp. Ovid. *Fasti*, v. 331ff. The foundation note for this development may perhaps be in Plutarch's reference to the *hetairae*, *Vita Rom.* iv. 6.

manners and speech which Cicero [1] sums up when, in one of his Orations, he has need to refer to the Palatine variant of the parent tradition: 'Fera quaedam sodalitas et plane pastoricia atque agrestis germanorum Lupercorum, quorum coitio illa silvestris ante est instituta quam humanitas atque leges.' Cicero has put the atmosphere of a most dark abyss of Time into his reference—much darker than the history of the cult allows; but his main interpretative allusions are, as they have been shown to be, true to the origin and growth of the Wolf-cult that included the goddess Flora.

But did Constantine survive Romulus? Or is he an intrusive figure because in a primal *Vita Constantini* the Romulus filiations with the Wolf and Dragon cults were worked out? Impartial evidence for the place of the Romulus and Wolf myth in the mind of Constantine is to be derived from his coins. The suckling Wolf was represented on them.[2] The makers of the coins of Constantine did not use a mythopœic fancy when designing them. Another external reason for the recognition of the presence of the Romulus who became a Constantine is in the date of the inauguration of Constantinople. The researches of Jules Maurice,

[1] *Orat. pro M. Caelio*, xi. 26 (ed. Müller, 1886, iii. ii. 92). Renel, *op. cit.* 91, also uses this passage; but from it deduces too easily totemic significations.

[2] Voetter, *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, 1892, Taf. iii. 135ff.

the first authority on the numismatics of Constantine, have issued in the disentangling of the dates of the dedication and inauguration of the city: the first he places towards the end of the year 324, and the second on the eleventh of May, in the year 330.[1] The importance of this temporal discrimination [2] cannot be exaggerated for the control of the material that went to the making of the primal *Vita Constantini*; since there is an unrecognised fusion of ritual information concerning the two ceremonies in the legends about Constantine that is to be seen, for example, in such an early source as John the Lydian. He joins together in a flowing narrative, the ceremonies connected with the naming of the city and those that accompanied its plotting out—indeed, so little was John conscious of the confusion that he places them in the above quaintly topsy-turvy order. We shall see that the myths yield a different and proper ritual for the founding of the city from the ceremonies that gathered about its inauguration. For each set of ceremonies the cult things covered by the name of Romulus

[1] Maurice, *Les Origines de Constantinople* (*Centenaire Recueil de Mémoires, Soc. Nat. des Antiquaires de France*, 1904), 281 ff.

[2] For a discussion of the necessary passage in Πατ. Κωνστ. i. 55; Codinus, 150; Theophanes, 23 (eds. as cited); Zonaras, xiii. 3, and *Fasti Idatii ad ann.*, may be assumed as coming within the investigation—since it or those actually studied have made similar temporal discussions; see Preger, *Hermes*, 1901, 336 ff.

supply a unifying bond. The Romanised Sabine cult of the Wolf and Flora, then, directed what was done when Constantine founded Constantinople. If that is true, some slight alteration must be made in Maurice's dating [1] for the foundation ceremonies.

The evidence that underlies this chapter and those on the *lituus* and the marking out of the city demands that his mensual date shall be altered though his annual date shall stand. When we turn back to Joannes Malalas, who inherited his material concerning the *Anthousa* ceremonial at the foundation of Constantinople, we find that he is accurate as to that, but inaccurate as to the date. He records: μηνὶ μαΐῳ τῷ καὶ ἀρτεμισίῳ ια'. The compiler of the *Chronicon Paschale* [2] follows him with a somewhat looser chronological sense both as to the month and the year of the ceremonial he records accurately. What Joannes Malalas dropped was the important liturgical factor in the dating of John of Lydus: τῇ πρὸ δεκαμιᾶς Καλενδῶν Μαΐων. The moderns have done what the ancients did before them. When judged by the marks on the sundial, the dates are not far out: when looked at from the standpoint of our evidence for the religious year without that factor, we may lose our temporal way and the

[1] Preger, *op. cit.*, 466 ff., had this date before Maurice. The latter is named in the text above because of his most useful chronological distinction.

[2] *Chron.* xiii. (ed. Niebuhr, 321 f.).

meanings of things in the history of Constantine. Seeck [1] has followed Mommsen's editing of the *Chronicon Paschale* and gives the same date as the French numismatist and the *Chronica Gallica*.[2] Thus both temporal and ritual congruity can be established for an *Anthousa* factor in the lost historical source for Constantine ; and as well our evidence permits us to lay bare the foundations and Constantinian superstructure of her religion. Constantine is not a mime where the Romulus tradition is concerned : he is a Wolf-suckling upon whom Sol has shone.

Before this chapter is closed, there remains the other problem about the second dislocate piece in the Lydian's composite paragraph on Romulus-Constantine. It has nothing to do with the Wolf-cult ; nor the Wolf in Folk-medicine. It can have as little relation with the historical Romulus or Constantine ; since we have to find that the passage is an intrusion from another writer. Students of the transmission of the text of Lydus know that one of its important sources is in excerpts made by a thirteenth century Byzantine monk named Maximus Planudes. His interests were wider than the theology of his Church in the Middle Age. A strict judge, or one with the abnormal ascetic emphasis such as was often produced in the Greek Church, would decide that he was somewhat

[1] *Register der Kaiser und Päpste*, 1919, 180.

[2] *Mon. Germ., Chronica Minora*, ix. 233 and 643.

secular or worldly in mind. His intellectual interests can be represented by a short writing of his that appears in the collection of minor Greek medical writers—his *De Morborum Materie* ;[1] and in another sort by his Greek translation of Macrobius' *Commentarium in Somnium Scipionis*—the popular writing by Cicero.[2] This second piece of work might perhaps save his cloistral face because of its portion in influencing mediaeval Patristic thought ;[3] but it is plain that for Planudes, the walls of his monastery ' did not a prison make,' a position that comes quite clear when we remember that he put Ovid into a Greek dress.[4] This last piece of work educes the reason for us to test a suggestion made by Hase and Creuza, who were early nineteenth century editors of Lydus, on the passage in him that is the reason for this last part of our chapter. They suggested[5] that herein might be a reference to the *Robigalia* and cited Ovid's *Fasti*[6] as their authority. The text, however, cannot bear this analogy either calendrically or religiously or textually. It is necessary to look

[1] Ed. Ideler, *Physici et Medici Graeci Minores*, 1842, ii. 318 ff.

[2] On this and other activities of Maximus Planudes, see Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzant. Lit.* 1897, 543 ff.

[3] Cp. Shedler, *Die Philosophei des Macrobius*, 1916, 104 ff.

[4] Ed. Boissonade, 'OBIΔΙΟΥ, Μεταμορφώσεις, 1822 (*Bibliotheca Classica Latina*, xvi.).

[5] Hase and Creuza, *Joannis Laurentii . . . de Mensibus*, 1827, 234.

[6] iv. 901 ff.

to the other phases of the monk's interests if we are to discover reasons why and how the passage has been introduced into Lydus—his care for Macrobius and his *flair* for medicine.

Maximus Planudes evidently knew his Macrobius ; and as he shows in his medical work, he was more than an excerptor[1] of Lydus. It appears patent that he was an annotator as well of *De Mensibus*. Now on turning to the larger work by Macrobius[2] we find him discussing the ordinances of Romulus concerning the religious year. When he comes to the Kalends of May he tells with large detail the story of the ' Myrtle Virgin ' whom the ' Serpent God ' met—' et coisse cum filia ' or virgin, as the text says more than once. The story of Romulus invades the text of Macrobius down to its closing sentences on the religious calendar. We have, then, in Planudes' knowledge of this author, and in the Romulus references at this particular point in his writings, the chief reason why the monk should have made a marginal comment on Lydus' calendrical entry about Romulus. The dates of Lydus and Macrobius agree. Moreover, when we look into the second writer with a view to ascertaining whether he could have inspired

[1] On this side of him, see especially Piccolomini, *Rivista di Filologia*, 1874, 101 ff. and 149 ff. ; Müller, *Rheinisches Museum*, 1881, 145 ff. ; Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis Historiarum Romanarum*, 1885, cxiii. f.

[2] *Saturnal.* I. xii. 5 ff.

the curious natural details which close the intrusive passage, we are again met with help.[1] A person with a turn for medical lore like Maximus Planudes would find it a light task to thread together his phrases by the convergent energies of Macrobius' suggestions. That this ascription of borrowed science from Macrobius is correct may be seen even more conclusively by means of one of the concluding passages in his larger work.[2] Macrobius here uses that shadowy physiographical and philosophical gossip whom he calls Eustathius,[3] and whose advice on the proprieties of speech and thought he quotes as if from an oracular source. This advice is intermingled in Macrobius' discussion on 'calor'—the parallel in Lydus at once presents itself to the mind.[4] We will transcribe some of the statements which are applicable to the whole of the statement the Lydian has been forced to make :

> His dictis Evangelus Eustathium intuens : Si rationi dictae adsentiris, ait, annuas oportet, aut si est quod moveat, proferre non pigeat, *quia vis vestri sermonis optinuit ne invita aure vos audiam.*[5]

[1] Cp. *Sat.* vii. 15, 20; *Som.* i. 6, 80, etc. and *De Morborum Materie*, 39 etc.

[2] *Sat.* vii. xvi, 19 ff.

[3] On him, see Cohn, *Pauly-Wissowa*, vi. i. 1447 *s.v.*

[4] iv. 74 : ἢ καὶ ἄλλης θερμῆς ὑγρασίας.

[5] Cp. *Sat.* vii. xvi. 15 : 'Et Evangelus : Quia et ex iocis seria facit violentia loquendi, hoc mihi absolvatis volo, cuius diu me exercuit vera deliberatio.'

The Lydian's text as edited by Wünsch opens with some words on foreseeing, and he is led to remark: ἀκρίσι λέγω καὶ ἐρυσίβαις καὶ ὡς οὐ προσηκόντως φαίνονται παρηγμένα, φησὶν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος, ὅτι γελοῖόν ἐστιν ἐγκαλεῖν τῇ προνοίᾳ, μᾶλλον δὲ καταγέλαστον. Macrobius proceeds to discuss summer heat and how it causes putrefaction, with strange details concerning heat from wood and its influence on men. These details, and those gathered before them, fused in the mind of Maximus Planudes and gave us the marginal note that has found its way into the text of *De Mensibus*. How can the naïve Apollonius be accounted for? It is certainly very different from Eustathius. The Lydian's text again serves us. On referring to it, the reader will notice that a very few lines before the Romulus-Constantine entry, the seventy-first section of *De Mensibus* has as its last but one word, Ἀπόλλωνες. In a mediaeval Greek manuscript, that word and the lines of the seventy-third section would be in very close touch: for the intervening section is most short. Therefore, the natural suggestion is that the scribal eye has carried the word Ἀπόλλωνες down into the intruded marginal note and made Ἀπολλώνιος by borrowing the tail of Eustathius' name. It was made from a god and a masculine nominal suffix.

What has this intrusive note displaced from the text of Lydus? Its preoccupation with virgins and gynaecological matter suggests that the story

of the god and the virgin—the veritable *Anthousa* context[1]—was originally in Lydus. Thus the Ilia reference would have its proper bridge-material between itself and the Anthousa reference : Romulus would have gone naturally on to Constantine and the emperor back to his spiritual forbear. There will have been no disrelated sentences in the Lydian's first statement: but an orderly move, from details about Romulus with Wolf and Flora background, to details about Constantine with mutated Wolf and Flora foreground.

[1] Note that Maximus Planudes would be conversant with a Roman version of the story in Dionysius of Halikarnassus, through Macrobius (*Sat.* I. xii. 24 f.), where he tells about the 'Myrtle Virgin' and the 'Serpent god,' perhaps the very version known to Constantine.

IV

CONSTANTINE AND CLAUDIAN DESCENT

EUMENIUS placed the Claudian purple on Constantine's shoulders.[1] Dessau and Seeck have disrobed him.[2] There is a gulf set between an imperial panegyrist and a modern critic; for one is dealing with the contemporary man, and the other with documents. So the current judgement may be summarised. But Eusebius of Cæsarea believed and popularised the myth of Eumenius; and Seeck, for instance, has attempted much towards the establishment of that historian's reputation, where he recounts the story of Constantine. When the position of to-day is written down thus baldly, we appear to have reached a trilemma: either Eumenius had larger warrant for his assertion of the Claudian descent of Constantine than has as yet been discovered; or modern authorities have committed a grave error in pro-

[1] *Panegyricus Constantino dictus*, VII, ii ff. (*P.L.* VIII. 624 ff.); *Gratiarum*, VIII. ii (643).

[2] Dessau, *Hermes*, 1889, 340 ff.; Seeck, *Gesch. des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, 1910, i. 111 and ii. 497.

claiming him to be the herald of a fictitious genealogy for the emperor ; or Eusebius of Cæsarea did work to the ' mass ' and ' line ' of which something has been said already. We cannot have history in the bishop and fiction in the panegyrist, when it is a question of the record of the same supposed fact : and it is as impossible to grant right of way over the history of Constantine to an hypothesis that has only a slender deductive basis in a panegyric. That style of literature can itself be so imperially imaginative towards historic fact that the rule appears to be a sound one which indicates, that unless other evidence external to the panegyric is found, then it and what hypothetical deductions are made from it are to be held suspect. It is quite true that the speech of a panegyrist can be as if its subject were talking of himself and to the world. Eumenius could have been the voice of Constantine. Emperors have been known to have grimly humorous methods for stimulating that sort of ventriloquism. Eumenius may be proved to have been a factor in the inauguration of the Claudian genealogy of Constantine : he is unlikely to be proved as being its originator or sole herald. There is no longer that gay simplicity in the writing of the history of Constantine which, for instance, is to be seen in those very early eighteenth century tractates on him that the University of Rostock liked to produce. The power of the hypothesis then was paramount.

Weidner's tractate displays that fact. It is entitled *Constantinus M. Superatis Juventae Discriminibus Legitimus Tandem Patris Constantii Successor*;[1] and opens on the indisputable note: 'Natus ac in lucem editus erat Constantinus M. ex legitimo matrimonio.' Seeck and Dessau have taught us all very much with regard to the emperor, and chiefly that the Rostock manner of historical writing belongs to the eighteenth century.

What then is their Eumenian hypothesis concerning Constantine?

In the year 310[2] Eumenius gave a panegyric in the presence of Constantine that promulgated for the first time the statement of the Claudian ancestry of the emperor. The reference by the panegyrist to the knowledge of these facts on the part of Constantine's intimates—'sed qui te amant plurimum sciunt'—has led to an antithetical conclusion that the ordinary folk did not know them. The reiteration of the natural rights of Constantine to throne and empire—for this is done by Eumenius several times in the course of his

[1] Rostochi, Typis Joh. Wepplingii, Univ. Tytogr (*sic*), 1702. The response by Göteke, *Constantinum Honeste et Ex Legitimo Matrimonio Natum* (Univ. Typog. is Wappling's correct description this time), has the same aldermanic movement. He lays it down, for example: 'quod Helena vere Britanna non tamen regiam, sed inediseram demum habuerit praesapiam.'

[2] Brandt. *Eumenius von Augustodunium*, 1882, 22 ff., dates the Orations—vii. in 310, viii. in 311.

speech—has suggested the conclusion that the orator was announcing a novel imperial doctrine to the surprise of the common people.[1] The first of these two points seems to be upheld by the text of the oration: 'A primo igitur incipiam originis tuae numine quod plerique adhuc fortasse nesciunt' —a statement followed, of course, by that about the knowledge of his intimates. The second point is also implicit in this citation, whilst the repetitions of imperial birthrights are certainly textually true. If this second characteristic is to be ascribed to rhetorical convention, the first still remains with its burden of what looks like fact.

The search for other literary support for this last-mentioned point leads us to an interesting chronological conclusion: these panegyrics of Eumenius are most likely the oldest literary evidence as yet disclosed for Constantine's Claudian descent. It is interesting to have these literary references in order. First comes Trebellius Pollio and his *Divus Claudius*[2] in which he projects the figure of Constantine, in the opening words of his eulogy, into the verbal image he limns of Claudius. Trebellius Pollio is a contemporary of Constantine and Eumenius. The presumption is that he is to be dated a little after the panegyric of Eumenius, for we know nothing about the date of the latter's

[1] *e.g.* Coleman, *op. cit.* 114.

[2] Ed. Peter, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, 1883, ii. 133 ff.

death. Next comes Eutropius,[1] a historian of about the middle of the fourth century, whose phrase: 'Constantinus per filiam nepos Claudi traditur,' shows that he knows the tradition. Eusebius of Cæsarea [2] follows in order with distant allusiveness in his phrases concerning the regality of Constantine—and his witness is to be dated somewhere before 340. The emperor Julian,[3] in the second half of the fourth century, makes two references in affirmation of the Eumenian genealogy for the man he criticised. An early mediaeval chronicle known as the *Anonymus Valesiani*,[4] closes this succession of witnesses with a laconic ascription of the discussed ancestry of the emperor. Then, with the possible exception of Trebellius Pollio, the orations of Eumenius contain the earliest recognised evidence for the assertion that Constantine was born in royal purple. On the whole, the choice of the sounding-boards for such a revolution in Constantine's ancestry does not seem to be right, if in the proclamation of the matter Eumenius is to be given priority. The panegyric was delivered in Trèves. The catalogue of witnesses, with their proximity to the panegyrist in time and their distance from him in

[1] *Brev. ab Urbe Condita*, ix. 22 (ed. Rühl, 1887, 68).

[2] *H.E.* x. 8. 4 (ed. Schwartz, 1908, ii. 892); cp. *Vita Const.* i. 50 (ed. Heikel, 1902, 31).

[3] *Orat.* i. 6D, ii. 51*c* (ed. Hertlein, i. 7 and 65).

[4] Ed. Mommsen, *Mon. Germ.*, *Auct. Antiq.* IX. i. 7.

geography, would appear to ask for place and means of announcement more at the centre of the empire than the little hoary city in *Belgica prima*. Constantine was in this period fond of that city, and it might be that Eumenius was giving forth news to the more Western portions of the empire. We may arrive at a position whence such a possibility can be judged: we are in safety as to truth when we conclude that the statement of the panegyrist actually means a previous knowledge of the news he publishes. What he knew his two orations can tell us.

It was natural that the dates on which the speeches were given and the news they conveyed should concentrate the attention of scholars on their chronological incidences. Certain cult references in them were overlooked to welcome the striking harmony of time and proclamation. Those cult allusions are, however, of the highest significance for the understanding of the mind of Eumenius, of how and what he did when he spoke in Trèves in 310, and of how and what Constantine meant when he permitted those orations.

The cult notes to which attention must be drawn are not many. There are but three in the first Trèves speech. They are these: (1) 'in Capitolini Jovis templo'; (2) 'haec religio Palatini sacrarii devota'; (3) 'Constantine, Apollinem tuum' or 'Apollo noster.'[1] The grouping of

[1] xv. (634A), xvi. (634A), xvi. (637B and 638A).

these names is not an artifice. They represent strands in the intellectual texture of the man who wove the eulogy. It will be noticed at once how they filiate with some of the chief cult names we have laid bare in the lost *Vita Constantini*. The attendant matters of political controversy, which are made to praise the emperor, may be left unnoticed here; since they do not affect the more substantial cult matters, and their source. For the association of the Capitoline with Jupiter is not a piece of oratorical obeisance to the popularity of the worship of that god at Trèves, during the Roman period,[1] as the Apolline view of Constantine is not the popular religion of Autun made to robe the emperor in unworldly glory. The concurrent march of these matters is set by something deeper than the tricks of oratory; for positive witness to that conclusion is in the reference to the Palatine.

The phrase used by Eumenius, 'haec religio Palatini sacrarii,' certainly covers the whole of the connotations of the cult centred in the name Romulus. Another nameless orator,[2] who panegyrised Constantine in 313, refers to Maxentius and perhaps his son in these terms: 'mox Romuli

[1] Hettner, *Die römischen Steindenkmäler*, 1893, 10 ff., catalogues fifteen Roman representations of Jupiter found in Trèves and neighbourhood.

[2] Cp. Chassot von Florencourt, *Erklärung der räthselhaften Umschriften der Consecrations-Munzen der Romulus*, 1843, 7 ff., who exposes the Romulus claims of Maxentius from his coins.

conservator expositi, tu aei falsum Romulum diu vivere, nec parricidam Urbis passus es enatare.' The words occur in a long apostrophe of Constantine as conqueror in 312. What Eumenius had spoken about in terms of religion—the implicit Romulus of the ancient hill-cult—was two years later spoken about in terms of politics, the explicit Romulus-Constantine of the most royal lineage. Also the Eumenian fusion of Apollo and Constantine keeps us to the same cult collocation as is represented by its most famous variant, the Palatine rites. The coins issued at Trèves,[1] at the period of the orations, declare Constantine's absorption in the cult of Sol. A Greek from Autun may be permitted to call the god by a name more familiar to him, and by so doing he is at least serving to bring into relief that a Sabine Apollo had passed creatively into the hill-cult of Sol with his dragon—that Romulus of the Wolf had become Constantine of the Sun's animal. The knowledge unknown to the many in Gaul, and on which Eumenius had built his orations, throws out everywhere lively links with that *Vita Constantini* which had stated his Romulus religion. We have not as yet, it will be seen, come upon the Claudian connexions of these high matters of history.

Trebellius Pollio,[2] and after him Nazarius,[3] can

[1] Maurice, *Num. Const.* i. 393 ff.

[2] *Claud.* 3 (p. 135).

[3] *Panegyr.* xxix. (*P.L.* viii. 602 A f.).

open the way between cult and political material in the source for Constantine upon the reconstruction of which we are engaged. In the course of his account of Claudius who merges into Constantine, Trebellius Pollio writes about the honours paid to him by the Senate, and states :

> Illi clypaeus aureus, ut grammatici locuntur, clypaeum aureum senatus totius iudicio in Romana curia conlocatum est, ut etiam nunc videtur expressa thorace uultus eius. illi, quod nulli antea, populus Romanus sumptu suo in Capitolio ante Iouis Optimi maximi templum statuam auream decem pedum conlocauit.

Nazarius has the ' clypaeus aureus,' and Eumenius the memory of the Capitoline Jupiter matter in our Constantinian source. We are now in a position to follow out these shy threads of literary relationship between Romulus, Constantine and Claudius. Much ancient evidence[1] makes the *gens Claudia* to be Sabine in origin. One terse phrase from Suetonius, ' Tito Tatio consorte Romuli,'[2] epitomises for us the unnatural orology and queerly disposed nomenclature of the original *Vita Constantini* ; for in it Tarpeia is brought close to

[1] *De Vita Caesarum* ; *Tiberius* (ed. Ihm, 1908, i. 110).

[2] *e.g.* Virgil, *Aen.* vii. 707 ff. ; Livy, *Hist.* iv. 3. 12 ff., x. 8. 6 ; Tacitus, *Ann.* iv. 9, xi. 24 ; Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* xiii, xxii. 8. Dionysius of Halikarnassus, *Antiq. Rom.* xi. 15 ; Zonaras, *Ep. Hist.* vii. 13. Also Lübert, *De Gestis Claudiae.* 1879 (*Schriften Univ. zu Kiel*, xxv.) ; Babélon, *Monnaies de la République Romaine*, 1885, i. 358 f. ; Mommsen, *History of Rome*, 1908, i. 493 ff.

Soracte, and Romulus, Claudius and Constantine are men of the same tradition and blood. The collusive interdependence of these varied writers on the *Vita* is apparent, from Eumenius and Eusebius to the trim falsity in the chronicle *Anonymus Valesiani*: 'divi Claudi . . . nepos ex fratre.' What an emperor has caused to be joined together a panegyrist would not separate. And the primal *Vita Constantini* is a necessity for the understanding of most of the literary evidence for the emperor. But Claudian purple was put on Constantine's shoulders by the priests of Sol. We may have, then, in his defence, to alter a previous judgement and say: what the priests of the Wolf that had become the Dragon had put together the emperor could not sunder. There seems to be more of religious motive in his assumption of glory than political pro- or anti-Diocletianism. Historians have been strongly inclined to the latter view in the one or the other fashion. Some have interpreted Eumenius as announcing an end to the method of Diocletian who favoured appointment to imperial position, and the substitution of the hereditary principle by Constantine. Others [1] have believed that though Eumenius gave the emperor a novel genealogy, Constantine upheld the Diocletian tradition of succession. The facts of history do not appear to support either view with any conclusiveness. Nor can it be said that

[1] *e.g.* Seeck, *op. cit.* i. 70 f., 186 f., etc.

a reform of Diocletian's ways, if there was such, had made any lasting impression on Roman imperial modes. The discovery of the religious context of the Claudian claim leads to a reason other than this theoretical annotating of supposed innovations on the part of Eumenius that was one in fact only for some of his hearers in Trèves. We cannot release Constantine from the ugly facts in his life, but we can try to put the man in his proper perspective. A move towards that desirable end is in the realisation that the manner of Claudius became his because of the Romulus religion he practised. It may be that justice to him will demand that we see in his Dragon variant of that religion the sign of an ancient Dacian religious predisposition, since that animal (*draco*) was the national emblem of Dacia.[1]

[1] Vaschide, *Histoire de la Conquête Romaine de la Dacie*, 1903, 45 (*Bibl. École des Hautes Études, Sciences Historiques*, Fasc. 142). In Rumanian Folk-Lore the snake was made of chips from the first clay wolf (Gaster, *Rumanian Bird and Beast Stories*, 1915, 82); is this a Dacian survival? And did Constantine obey an ancient monition when he changed the Wolf into the Dragon?

V

CONSTANTINE AND THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY

THERE are two reasons why English interest should be large in the story of the founding of Constantinople: we have with it old and delightful literary alliances, and we have through it the modern endeavour to make us responsible for some unhistorical qualities. Aldhelm and that fascinating company of writers who are among the chief glories of Wessex are sufficient to give us joy in the legend, whilst Friederich [1] and Coleman [2] are able to make it piquant enough for us to examine if their theories are correct. Our first interest should spring from national pride in the hospitality given to the Constantinian story by those writers who kept learning alive in times of feeble outreaching after the things which are more than the fingers can touch; and our second interest must spring from the desire to test whether sharp controversial argument or an apparent inability for the study of the morphology of legend should permit us to

[1] *Die Constantinischen Schenkung*, 1889, 136 ff.

[2] *Op. cit.* 148 ff.

have things said about us which, shall we say, the gentle Jane Austen would have challenged. For Friederich says that we adopted and adorned the legend because of the growing Ultramontanism of England from the time of Aldhelm; and Coleman ascribes to the contemporary and later English a gift of grotesque myth-making which centred itself upon the figure of Constantine. Both these views are to be looked upon as theoretical outgrowths: they do not issue from the real study of the legend. It is the letter of Aldhelm that matters and not the spirit that is alien to him and his version of the myth, since this belongs to his critics.

Aldhelm has two versions of the Constantine-Silvester traditions, one in prose and another in poetry, each having the same title—*De Virginitate*.[1] Some details occur in one version which are not in the other. This is not evidence of several sources, but of the author's temperament. He was a scholarly poet, and when he came to write poetry, there were details which would go into verse with something like irresistible request. The whole of the contents of Aldhelm's versions must be glanced at, because the editor of the most recent and sumptuous edition of his writings—this memorial to a great name in our literary history was, of course, raised by a German scholar—seems inclined to believe in the Malmesbury

[1] Ehwald, *Aldhelmi Opera*, 257 ff. and 375 ff. 1909. (*Mon. Germ.*, *Auct. Antiq.* xv.)

Father's use of more than one source. This question of sources is not merely a curious one to interest the student of the subtle manners of literary inheritance: it has also importance for the history of Constantine and the beginning of the epoch he represents.

Thus Aldhelm's prose version contains the following incidents wrought in his own eruditely compact and sometimes waywardly precious literary style: (1) The incident of the Dragon, 'pestifero spiritus anhelitu aethera corrumpens'; (2) Constantine and his leprosy, 'et elefantiosa corporis incommoditas,' with the cure by baptism at the hands of Silvester; (3) The Convocation of the Jewish Rabbis, 'duodenos Iudeorum praeceptores et fariseorum rabbites'; (4) Constantine's vision of the plotting of the city. His poetic version has the same number and order of incidents. It differs from the prose *De Virginitate*, as we have said, in its optical quality—it reveals an eye that could choose the picturesque in the Constantine-Silvester source.

For instance, he closes the incident of the Dragon as if he knew the cult significance of the animal, and was celebrating the turning of the Solar tables on him:

> Idcirco statim baptismi gratia fulgens
> Caelitus illuxit Romanis arcibus ut sol;

or when he writes about Constantine's leprosy he does not omit the 'scaly' feature: 'ulcera squamis'; or in the Convocation he has not lost

the Zambres feature and the calling back of the bull to life. When the legend of the founding of the city is dealt with Aldhelm does not recall other features of his source, which the prose version has dropped, but he lends to his original certain architectural details that might have been gathered on his journeys in our West country; or perhaps he had conflated his own abbatial town with the Rome he had seen.[1] These things serve to show that there is no wide literary divergence between Aldhelm's two versions of the Constantine-Silvester stories, for the second of them only manifests a few notes of poetic licence or freedom of choice of material. It may be concluded that, if the Wessex scholar got his material from Rome, then there must have been great interest in Constantine during the time of his visit to the papal city. There is nothing in Aldhelm's writings to lead us to believe that he had gone to Rome with an intention to enlarge his admiration or knowledge of the emperor. New Rome must have been very much in the mind of ancient Rome that the colours of her legends should have stained some pages of *De Virginitate*.

For Aldhelm's source the most illuminative comparison is to be made between a portion of the

[1] *De Virginitate* was written about the same time as Aldhelm's visit to Rome or a little after; cp. Browne, *St. Aldhelm*, 1903, 312 ff.; Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 1911, i. 138.

text of the *Vita Sylvestri* in Lippomanus-Surius and the Wessex writer's two versions :

De Virginitate.	Vita Sylvestri.
praeditus ad letiferum Romae draconem in clandestino criptae speleo latitantem, qui virulentis faucibus et pestifero spiritus anhelitu aethera corrumpens miserrimum populum atrociter vexabat, per centenos latebrarum gradus introrsum descendisse fertur . . . a funesto victimarum ritu evangelicis assertionibus et signis pariter coruscantibus correxit.	Ei autem draconi quotoquoque mense alimenta ab eis large suppeditabantur ; qua quidem prestigiatores cum virginibus incontatricibus assumantes, in etiam speluncam per multos gradus descendebant, et in ea execranda peregentes mysteria, in quibus nulla insignis durat abominatio, illic cibis relictis reuertebantur. Certis autem temporibus draco repente ascendens, foras quidem non egrediebatur : sed iacantes in ingressu cauernae, uenenato anhelitu corrumpebat aerem ex quo mors afferebatur vicinis, magis autem imminebat interitus infantibus . . . multi ex infidelibus, et ipsi qui nuper seruiebant draconi accurrerunt ad sanctum, et fatebantur esse magnum Deum, quem ipse praedicebat et rogabant ab diuinum baptismum assequerantur. . . .

In the next paragraph of the *Vita*, as in the *De Virginitate*, there follows the incident of Constantine's leprosy. Two sentences from the former will be sufficient to compare with the latter, that we may establish connexions between the two sorts of writings :

De Virginitate.	Vita Sylvestri.
Horrida leprosis explodens ulcera squamis (line 568).	male ulcera fecit Imperatorem ; and
et elefantiosa corporis incommoditas (prose version, p. 258).	et floruit lepra per uniuersam carnem.

The *Vita* contains as its successive story that of the Convocation of the Jewish leaders, whilst it names the chief magician Zembras and tells in full detail the story of the restoration of the bull. What is not in it is the story of the founding of the city. That is in the *Legenda* in the order required by the writings of Aldhelm. Thus, when we consider the close verbal and formal parallels between this *Vita* and the *De Virginitate*, the conclusion follows that Aldhelm was dependent on the source of the *Vita Sylvestri* for his account of the Constantine legends—the extent of which source is further illustrated by the contents of the *Legenda*. Now Aldhelm was in Rome during the pontificate of Sergius.[1] The *Liber Pontificalis*,[2]

[1] Manitius, *op. cit.* i. 134, dates the visit 693, that is two years before the accepted date of *De Virginitate*.

[2] Duchesne, i. 374 and 379.

where it records the doings of that pope, shows that Sergius was engaged with the task of reviving or maintaining interest in Constantine.[1]

The natural conclusion to come to is that the papal interest communicated itself to Aldhelm and that, as the text of his two versions of the

[1] It should be recalled that just about a century before Sergius, when Gregory the Great was in his place, there was a Constantinian movement in Langobardian circles. Queen Theodelinda appears to have been the co-initiator with the pope of an endeavour towards actually realising the 'Acta Constantini.' The mosaics set up in the basilica of St. John at Monza show plainly what is meant. One, for instance, represents King Agilufus, persuaded by Theodelinda from Arianism, being baptised in Pavia; another shows the queen as the central figure in the commerce between Byzantium and the Langobard country (Fumagalli and Beltrami, *La Cappella detta della Regina Teodelinda nella Basilica di San Giovanni a Monza*, 1891, Tav. xxviii. and xlii.; cp. Zucchi, *L'Historia della Serenissima Theodelinda, Reina de' Langobardi*, 1613, 18 f., 44). Note also the Queen's interest in Constantinopolitan saints. A seventh century papyrus leaf at Monza contains the following names:

(Line 6)	sanctae Sofiae cum tres filias suas.
(Lines 26 *sq.*)	sanctae [Sapie]ntia.
	sanctae Sp[ei].
	sanctae Fidei.
	sanctae Ca[rita]tis.

And the leaf is signed: 'Quas olea sancta temporibus domni Gregorii papae adduxit Iohannes indignus et peccator domnae Theodolindae reginae de Roma.' (Steffens, *Lat. Pal.* i. Taf. 22; cp. De Rossi, *La Roma sott. cristiana*, i. 133 and 175.) On the whole subject of this note, cp. Coustant. (*P.L.* viii. 1387*a*): 'Silvestri pseudoconstituto in vetere collectione Langobardicis litteris, etc.

Constantine-Silvester matter shows, he knew the Latin *Vita* which was utilised by the Lippomanus-Surius *Vita Sylvestri* and the *Legenda* ascribed to Eusebius. His two works *De Virginitate*, therefore, do not give witness to a peculiar emphasis in ecclesiastical matters any more than to a curious mythopæic faculty of the English mind. His interest is a literary one, and probably the sign of a scholarly poet who had been in Rome.

The qualities of his rendering of the foundation legend are interesting, because of differences from earlier writers. Constantine is said to have had a vision in which an old woman appeared to him, who, after he had prayed, turned into a beautiful maiden—'bella puella.' Then she was robed in the imperial mantle and crowned. And his mother Helena exhorted him to care for the woman in the vision always. Constantine was troubled and could not understand what the dream meant, therefore he fasted seven days, and Silvester appeared to interpret it; the old woman was ancient Byzantium, the young one was the city he should create. Constantine was to clothe himself in the robes he had worn at his baptism, and to ride the same horse he had when at Rome, when thus he visited the tombs of the Apostles. As he rode he was to hold the *labarum* in his right hand and to trail it on the ground, so that the furrows it made should be the plotting out of the walls of the city. The name of the new city was to be Constantinople.

Aldhelm's version of the legend has most honourable descent in later British writers, for he is cited by William of Malmesbury [1]—a winsome pair of names to have been connected with the West-country monastery—and again, by way of William, in the *Abbreviationes Chronicarum* of Radulf de Diceto.[2] This home use of the earlier scholar, however, will not encourage the makers of theories concerning England and the English mind. Malmesbury was but true to her own teachers when William cited Aldhelm; and Diceto made himself of that house, in the second degree, by using the high authority of the historian who had busied himself on its founder. There is not more in this matter of literary descent than the use of literary sources proper to the Middle Age. But how came Aldhelm into possession of his version of the legend?

The *Legenda* [3] solves that problem. Therein is the account of Constantine's vision, and Aldhelm's source. For instance in his prose version he writes: 'Orante autem Constantino illa avicula surrexit et facta est iuvencula pulcherrima'—that is literally in the *Legenda* (fol. 22 *a* 1). Then in order follow: Helena's advice, Constantine's prayer and fasting, Silvester's interpretation in

[1] *Gesta Reg.*, iv. 354 (ed. Stubbs, 1889, ii. 410).

[2] *Sub* cccxv; Ed. Stubbs, 1876, 74 f. Radulf's literary sense was keener than his chronological sense.

[3] Fol. 21 *b* 2 to 22 *a* 2.

identical terms with those of Aldhelm, and closing its statement as the British writer does: 'Appellata est ciuitas Constantini, quod greco sermone *dicitur Kaide, et quod latine* interpretatur Constantinopolis usque hodiernum diem' (fol. 22 *a* 2).

The italicised phrase in that sentence is omitted in Aldhelm, and he has kept the textual tradition as if it read: 'quod graeco sermone interpretatur Constantinopolis, etc.' The Malmesbury scholar is correct, and the scribe of the *Legenda*, or his copy, is wrong; since a Greek name for Constantinople has been composed from the conjunctional link in the Greek sentence about the city's name, that is *και δη*, upon which the Latin compiler of the *Legenda* has exercised his imagination. Its presence in the printed text of this lost writing is a refined proof of the Graeco-Latin nature of the *Vita Sylvestri* current in Rome when Aldhelm was there. There can now be no doubt that Aldhelm used the same source for his Constantine-Silvester material in his two *De Virginitate*, since the two versions are employed in the above comparison with the text of the *Legenda*, and the final proof in the sentence about the name of the city is from the prose account. Once more we are able to see that the Malmesbury writer is handling his material as should a scholar who is a poet. Having then found the style of the legend in the time of Pope Sergius,

we must strike back our enquiry from him as to its original shape.

There are three principal versions earlier than that of his time, and they can supply us with directive means to analyse the legend to its base and to discriminate its original dual lines and growth. Our authorities are Sozomen, Philostorgius and John the Lydian. At first, it seems as if we were in another atmosphere altogether when we turn to the Church historian from the Church scholar-poet; for Sozomen's account[1] of the legend has attached and corporal matter not to be found in Aldhelm. For instance, he has the appended story of Constantine's first attempt to build a city on a Trojan site, but he saw God in a vision,[2] who told him to seek another site. Thus he was led to the Thracian Byzantium and commanded to build a worthy eponymous city. Obeying the words of God, he enlarged the city that was first called Byzantium, and ringed it about with greater walls. Some familiar notes are in this rendering of the story. We are told that Constantine was going to imitate the building of Rome. Further, there is the fact of the epony-

[1] *H.E.* ii. 3 (*P.G.* lxvii. 936 c *f.*)

[2] Seeck, *op. cit.* ii. 473, considers this to be history. His opinion is based upon his interpretation of *Cod. Theodos.* xiii. 5, 7, 'pro commoditate urbis quam aeterno nomine jubente deo donavimus.' We have seen that this has to do with a name of the city and not with its plotting out; cp. Coleman, *op. cit.* 149, 3.

mous naming of the city, and more significant still is the end of his legend where he talks of surrounding the city with greater walls—for that indicates his knowledge of the legend in the form where the marking out of the walls follows the account of his emulation of Romulus. It is to be suspected that the attached piece about the building of a city on a Trojan site, near to the tomb of Ajax, is Sozomen's manner of recording that the legend of Constantine's plotting of his city had two lines of development—a Romulus or pagan line and a Christological line. Philostorgius[1] will serve to mark more clearly these two early phases of the story's development.

This historian omits the visionary detail of Sozomen, as was right, and says that Constantine walked about his city with a spear in his hand to mark its sweep. Certain who were with him thought that he was making its space too great, but the emperor replied that he must go on until he who led him stopped. Thus he showed that a certain *Heavenly Dynamis* was leading him. Philostorgius appears to be more concerned with the painting of the legend somewhat in the style of the Dutch brothers Maris—you can see the planning and Constantine in a sort of opalescent mist. The circumstance of Aldhelm could not be seen in such treatment of the legend. Philostorgius is a different man, in a different time, from the British

[1] *H.E.* ii. 9 (ed. Bidez, 20 f.).

scholar. They come together, however, in two fundamental things—in both of their accounts, Constantine is plotting out the city by perambulation, and he is being led by someone. In the latter matter is the Christological development of the story. On this, which makes the dual phrase of the legend's growth, Aldhelm has kept a very old note, if we do a simple thing that Ehwald omitted in his fine edition of this Father's works—that is if we put capitals to one of his phrases thus: 'eum (*i.e.* Constantine) duxerit Angelus Dei.'[1] The reason for doing the same small but important deed for Philostorgius, which was not done by Bidez, comes into view. He ought to have printed his text, where it speaks of the one who led Constantine in this manner: ὡς Δύναμις αὐτοῦ τις Οὐρανία κτλ. We shall understand fully the reasons for these claims when we come to Constantine as a builder of churches; for our purpose now we may say that in these two names are ancient titles for Jesus Christ, which, with varying depth of content, were used for Him from the earliest Christian times, through and in the

[1] Later accounts of the legend lose this significant detail. For instance, a Greek *Vita Constantini*, edited by Franchi de Cavalieri (*Studi e Documenti di Storia e Diritto*, 1896, 97 f.—cited also by Bidez, 21), has watered it down to ἀγγέλων; or the anonymous Πατρ. Κωνστ. iii. 10, has τὸν ἄγγελον; or in George the Monk, *Chronicon*, iv. clxxx., where this strain has been totally lost, though he has the Sozomenian hesitancy about the site.

Arian controversy, and afterwards with a fading memory of first meaning, in theological literature down to the late days of the Middle Age. The values to be put into these titles will appear: we are to see now that they mark the presence of a second line of development. The first or basic line of the legend demands further investigation.

John the Lydian is our remaining principal source of evidence. The second half of his Romulus-Constantine statement details the plotting out of the oldest city of Rome—how oxen are yoked to the plough and the boundaries of the city are thus cut in the earth. It is the method Livy [1] describes, who adds the designation 'Etruscan,' as do Cato [2] and Varro,[3] to explain whence such rites come. That description is the same as our Sabine. Through these Roman authorities, who interpret the ground of Lydus' statement, we are brought back to those right topographical and ritual details which compose the Romulus document that was incorporated in the lost *Vita Constantini*. There are hints and gleams of that *Vita* in the varying versions of the legend of the city's foundation in Philostorgius and Sozomen and Aldhelm. It is true that in them the Roman ploughing note has gone. How it went is not difficult to discover. Let us recall the *lituus*

[1] I. xliv. 4.

[2] Servius *ad Aen.* v. 575.

[3] *Ling. Lat.* v. 14. 3.

parenthesis in John the Lydian.[1] According to him the assumption of the augurship and the augural sign, the *lituus*, was a chief feature of the Romulus story. In Philostorgius the *lituus* had become a spear, in Aldhelm the *labarum*. An early compression of Romulus matter in the *Vita Constantini* had forced out the plough and put into prominence the *lituus*. That instrument in a partially Christian version became the spear, and in a wholly Christian version the *labarum*. In Philostorgius the augur is still on foot, though the spear has displaced the earlier more potent staff; whilst in Aldhelm, who reflects the state of the legend in Pope Sergius' time, the baptismal legend has moulded a companion legend of the founding of the city so that Constantine could do nothing else but ride in his baptismal robes with an alleged Christian emblem in his hand. These variants all go back to the Sabine-Roman document which described a Constantine who had lived and moved on the earth between the city which Romulus is said to have made and the city that his emulator had created.

[1] It is to be noticed that by John's time the *lituus* was taking on a form later than the first crooked stick, for he describes it as an 'hieratic horn.' On the change from *lituus* to spear, see Deubner, *Hermann Usener zum Siebzigsten Geburtstage*, 1905, 71 f. For good bibliographical note on *lituus* and its different forms and uses, Pease, *Cicero De Divinatione*, i. 140, *s.v.* (*Illinois Studies in Language*, etc., 1920, 140).

VI

CONSTANTINE AND THE BUILDING OF CHURCHES

THERE is a humorous law of compensation at work in the myth of Constantine. A simple ritual act of his in his first days begets a legend that in turn creates a numerous ecclesiastical literature, so by the way of balance the makers of myths have forced him to become, from a small effort in the contrivance of shrines, a multitudinous builder of churches. Over a period of some centuries—from the framing of the Silvester notice in the *Liber Pontificalis* down to the thirteenth century—ingenious and compilative minds were at work to exhibit, we may suppose, the grace of anti-Sabinism. The dust of one Sol shrine was turned into the soaring walls of many churches. That engaging category called Progress, which still is very elusive of definition, may cause us to assert that this is the way Constantine ought to have gone. But emperor and evidence, which both insist on going as they will with no regard for the writer or institution that will tidy them up or

docket them, have their imperious manners of turning the 'ought' of apology into the 'must' of the way that was taken. Thus the ancient shrine remains, and most of the churches fall away into weightless dust at the touch of fresh or freshly understood evidence. The imposing structure of tradition vanishes and leaves the tiny unimposing reality—for often the two are very different in size and style. There should be no regret in us because the two are not commensurate. An oasis is better than a city of mirage. There cannot be another judgement than that for the historian, and the last humour of it all is to see how naturally such a man as Constantine divests himself of the too grandiose ensemble into which he has been put that he might live in the lesser context of his own career. His true context of life, though smaller than the place in which controversy has set him, alone can make him more significant for the history of the Western world.

We propose then to set out the evidence for Constantine as a builder of churches in such a manner as to disclose a critical documentary basis for his prowess. Three determining orders of fact are requisite for this purpose: (1) An answer to the questions, whether or no Constantine built a church called *Hagia Sophia*; (2) Whether or not he built a church with name *Irene* to the memory of a saint or an abstraction? (3) Whether or not there is any evidence for his having raised churches

to the memory of the Apostles or to the numerous company of saints named in late Byzantine writers? These enquiries into sources, etc., will also serve to answer another problem, which in the end is religiously Constantinopolitan though it is not topographically of that city, namely: Is there any truth in the ascription to Constantine of the first Peter basilica and the accompanying Roman foundations as recorded in the *Liber Pontificalis*?

As late as the year 1912, authorities on Byzantine churches, such as Van Millingan, are found saying that Constantine did not found *Hagia Sophia*. The last expression of opinion of the archaeologist we have mentioned is of such a sort that it must be examined. He says[1] that 'the idea that S. Eirene formed one member of a triad of sanctuaries erected by Constantine the Great to the glory of Christ, under the respective names of Peace, Wisdom, Power, is without any foundation.' He goes on to remark that the authority of Nicephorus Callistus is only that of a late writer, and that 'we know that the Church of the Holy Wisdom was erected not by Constantine the Great,[2] but by his son and successor.' We may remark upon this summary judgement that it is

[1] George, *The Church of St. Eirene at Constantinople*, 1912, 2, in a *Historical Notice*.

[2] Cp. *e.g.* Lethaby and Swainson, *The Church of Sancta Sophia, Constantinople, A Study of Byzantine Building*, 1894, 15, who accept the authority of the *Chronicle* 'with perhaps a little suspicion on the part which refers to Constantine.'

to be doubted that anyone holds the opinion of the creation of a formal triad of churches ascribed to a triplicate of names or attributes of Jesus Christ. It is hard to find ancient authority for just those three. Also that Nicephorus is not peculiar among earlier chroniclers for the possession of evidence for some activity of Church building on the part of Constantine. The third strand of Van Millingan's opinion brings us, moreover, to its most serious oversight. In 1904, Maurice published his important study on the Origins of Constantinople,[1] wherein not the least valuable item was to find that the *Paschal Chronicle*,[2] speaking of the dedication of *Hagia Sophia* in 360, indicates that its building was begun some thirty-four years before. The vaguer reference to such works of building in the oration delivered by Themistius[3] before Constans II. is, as Maurice has also pointed out, good support for the *Chronicle*. The orator reminds the emperor that he was given imperial honours at the foundation of Constantinople. That event took place on November the eighth, in the year 324.[4] The mathematician

[1] *Centenaire*, etc. 284 f.

[2] *P.G.* xclii. 737*a*. Cp. Seeck, *Regesten*, 207, who does not appear to appreciate the important distinction. Pulgher, *Les Anciennes Églises Byzantines de Constantinople*, 1878, 18 f., is an example among less recent writers who grasped the distinction.

[3] *Orat.* iv. 58*b* (ed. Dindorf, 1832, 69).

[4] *Pasch. Chron.* 704*c*.

will remark upon the difference of two years between these two witnesses. He would be exact, and also he would not understand the ways of the chronicler, who, as he shows in other instances, has a habit of allowing himself, or his pendulum, the space of two years in which to swing.[1] But there is not merely the chronological argument for Constantine's founding of *Hagia Sophia*, there is as well the more important one that arises from new findings concerning his religion. This latter argument, together with its support, is able to bear the weight of the first structure of the remarkable church. For the present, we affirm on ancient evidence that Constantine did plan and build *Hagia Sophia* which his son enlarged.

Our second question involves the church historian Socrates, and leads us to the next step in the realisation of Constantine's ways as a builder of churches. There has been difficulty hitherto in coming to a just estimate of his dedicatory values. The pressure, from the apologetical side, has been so strong that it has not been thought well to

[1] *e.g.* Constantine is said to name Constantinople in the year 328 (708*c* f.). This habit is not to be counted against the chronicler. A comparison with the *Idatii Fasti* (*P.L.* li. 908*a*), shows that the bishop has a wider swing, for he puts the dedication of Constantinople under Gallicanus and Symmachus, *i.e.* in 330. Lethaby and Swainson, *op. cit.* 15, seem to put more trust in Idatius than the *Paschal Chronicle*. The standard of values of these competent architects is seen again when they remark on Socrates 'probably the best authority.'

admit, in any particular, that Constantine could have dedicated a church to a principle rather than to a person; and the tendency, on the critical side, has been to Arianise him to the degree that he should only consecrate buildings to essences rather than to entities. One part of the statement of Socrates [1] is helpful towards the correct resolution of a dilemma made by contending theologies. He tells us that an older church to a Saint Irene was made bigger and gaudier by Constantine, who dedicated it to *Irene*. Architectural research [2] upholds, it seems, the fact of an earlier and later edifice. The first dedication, then, was to a person, and probably to a Thessalonican martyr with the name Irene; [3] the second or Constantinian dedication was to *Peace*. The notice by Socrates denies us the right to conclude that this name was connected with that of Jesus Christ. It certainly was given to a church; Socrates is explicit on that point. The juxtaposition in his notice of the uprising of Arianism and of the building of the churches to *Sophia* and *Irene* ought not to cause us to equate the two matters as of necessity, and as if the ecclesiastical names meant embodiments of Arian concepts; though that juxtaposition in the mind of the

[1] *H.E.* i. 16, ii. 16; *P.G.* lxvii. 116*c* f. and 217*b*.

[2] George, *op. cit.* 84 ff.

[3] Cp. Honorati, *Notizie reguardente il Culto di Santa Irene Martire*, 1783, 6.

historian seems to have determined him to leave those names colourless. The conclusion we must draw from his statements is that the older church was dedicated to a person, and that the newer one, raised by Constantine, was named after a potency. This conceptual move does represent a bit of Constantine's intellectual history. This too will be seen as our investigation grows.

The third question set by the mythical extension of Constantine's piety demands a control over the power that pictures him as making several great and distant cities white with churches. Constantinople, Rome and Jerusalem are far apart. Even for an emperor geographical distance does not shorten, nor does Time award him such privileges that he may accomplish in a few years what, for instance, a succession of modern governments might do if there were no temporal obstructions like debates and elections. The chroniclers of his architectural work seem to have had doubts about this matter. The early Greek writers dubiously write two or four ecclesiastical foundations after his name, and the later Greek writers oscillate between a number as small as theirs and another so large as to cause the student to believe that something in the nature of what moderns call ' dumping ' had been done, under the name of Constantine, with ancient churches. An eminent illustration of this is in the Silvester notice of the *Liber Pontificalis* where, apart from

the building of churches, Constantine is depicted as an ecclesiastical benefactor of a sort that rivals the exhaustless growth and charity in riches of the fabled Sultans. A German historian has described Constantine's imperial methods as 'Sultanism'—there is surely ample warrant for that appellation in the Silvester enhancement of the emperor's portrait. The critical scholar must, however, begin his studies in Constantinople and finish in the city of Romulus if he would come to more lucid conclusions than those writers of to-day who are content to say to tradition, 'what Constantine did not build he must have inspired; therefore, Roman and Byzantine estimates of his deeds are to be believed.' The problem of such an attitude is that perhaps neither inspiration nor foundation belongs to Constantine, and therefore the imposing superstructure of Western ecclesiastical history based on these matters has in no particular connexions with him. Were such a conclusion demonstrated it would have importance for our knowledge of Constantine and of the history of the churches in the West. It has in part been made, especially by the most erudite editor of the *Liber Pontificalis*; our task is with the remainder.

It is necessary to approach this phase of our work without any presuppositions as to the facts or qualities of the Christianity of Constantine—or perhaps it should be said in this way, as if we were unaware that any claim had been made for his

conversion in the year 314. A known Catholic apologist [1] writes, when studying the Spelio inscription which was raised to the family of Constantine —'aedis nostro nomini dedicata'[2]—that the Constantine who accepts this dedication is 'chrétien convaincu sinon encore baptisé.' The earliest date we can give to the inscription is 327. It is much that at this date it should be recognised by traditionalists that Constantine was not baptised. Thus Batiffol has removed the apologetic tension of the general claims for the contemporaneity of Constantine's baptism and Christianity, if he has done nothing else. The question whether or not the emperor was a convinced Christian can be left to the proof or disproof of historical research. Our point here is not a controversial one, but the ethical one that new findings always ask—that a certain suspension of judgement should be exercised with regard to the cardinal points in the accepted ecclesiastical treatment of the life of Constantine.

The order of our examination of the church-building tales has been determined for us by their recorders. We ought then to begin with the earlier traditions and their smaller number of ascriptions and work on to the later traditions with the prolific white growths in dedications.

[1] Batiffol, *Les survivances du culte impérial romain*, 1920, 14.

[2] Dessau, *Inscriptiones*, 1892, i. 705, where is a summary of arguments for the date of the inscription.

And whatever criticism has to say upon them, whether of support or excision, we may recognise the piety that hides the faults of a man so deep beneath monuments, actual or imaginary, that he is deprived of them all. The gesture is a kindly one; but History will still ask her questions. We will look into first the Socratean and Sozomenian traditions of Constantine's doings in respect of Churches.

We have seen already that Socrates emits, in his notice of the emperor, a kind of regulative test for the nature of his dedications. A saint becomes a moral expression or quantity: S. Irene becomes *Irene*. In both places, where Socrates speaks of Constantinian churches, this second appears without any distinguishing adjective or adjunct. In the first of these places, Constantine is credited with the building of the Church of the Apostles, as his second foundation in Constantinople. In the other place, *Irene* alone is mentioned as his; and to his son is ascribed *Sophia*—again a name without adjective or adjunct. Two suggestions arise from this the shortest list of churches said to have been built by Constantine: that Socrates is evidently not very certain in his knowledge; and that he has made a mistake in not ascribing the foundation of *Sophia* to Constantine the Great. It is a little curious, surely, that we should find this historian saying that the emperor depersonalised a saint to make a church, but he also raised a church to the

persons of the Apostles. This contrast gains sharpness when we recall the efforts of most writers, from Eusebius downwards, to make *Sophia* into a person. We need an authority, external to these writers, to guide us as to the line Constantine was likely to take in such matters. That authority is to be found on his coins, and not in the panegyrists. The coins speak history, while the orators make encomiums.

It is a matter of common knowledge that Diocletian gave peculiar importance to his imperial attributes. Through some of them he had spiritual relationship with many gods. He was neighbour to Hercules, Jupiter and Mars; when he was not arrayed in his own panoply of quasi-divine virtues.[1] Diocletian placed his throne on Olympus and set himself upon it. The panegyrists were not content with this—they decked him out as the embodiment of Neo-Platonism. Now the coins of Constantine, especially in the early issues, witness to the same kind of genealogical aspirations. We do not know that he did esoteric sartorial feats, like Diocletian ;[2] we are quite sure that, without the example of Diocletian, Constan-

[1] Hirschfeld, *Sitzungsberichte Akad. der Wissenschaft zu Berlin*, 1901, 605 ff. ; Gneichi, *The Coin Types of Imperial Rome*, 1911, 11 and 34 ; Wissowa, *op. cit.* 275 ff. ; Maurice, *Num. Const.* II. cxi. ff. Cp. also Engelhard, *De Personificationibus quae in Poesi atque Arte Romanorum*, 1881.

[2] Eutropius, *Brev.* ix. 26, who put aside the imperial purple for garments hung with precious stones.

tine made himself what he was, not by means of statue and inscription. The panegyrists have done their best to make him a Neo-Platonist. The coins appear to lend them their aid in this form of sartorial work. They do not, however, succeed. Constantine owes more in respect of this philosophical raiment to the makers of his money with their Diocletian traditions than some authorities[1] have been willing to allow. Even when he proclaimed himself as having divine values, he was most Constantinian. The face within the radiant symbol of Sol was his own. These divine virtues which find themselves described or designed on the emperor's coins seem to evince the same moral. We can test this opinion by means of the imperial emphasis, so to say, among those virtues. Constantine raises a church to Irene. A large number of his coins, struck between the years 320 and 324, bear the words BEATA TRANQUILLITAS.[2] The church or 'temple' celebrated a historic event and not an abstraction. *Irene* is Greek for the Latin noun. Constantine could deal in deeds but not in ideas. We shall see later that the rise of Nike confirmed this view of the inception of its counterpart, *Irene*. The imperial emphasis falls on that which represents some historic achievement.

With this as a sort of clue, we cannot avoid

[1] Cp. Maurice, *op. cit.* II. cxxvii. ff.

[2] Maurice, i. 428 ff.; II. cxxxiii. 55 ff., 115 ff.

noticing that the imperial coins make use of the motto SAPIENTIA PRINCIPIS.[1] On the other side of these coins is the figure of Minerva; and the panegyrists make Constantine the mouthpiece of her wisdom. For the student of the man, it is much more to the point to notice the date when such coins were made. For example, a gold coin struck in Arles in the year 313 bears the legend; and it is to be read on bronzes struck in Rome just after the war of 314. The church or 'temple' to *Sophia* was not founded till near the end of Constantine's life. Between those two dates is a gap of years in which the emperor is represented as being wholly Christian—after an alleged vision at the battle of the bridge—or variously eclectic in religion, according to the taste of his interpreters[2] with the Milanese Edicts, the symbol seen in vision, and the syncretisms of the symbols on his coins. The Edicts do not formulate Christian belief. They exhibit a certain quality of tolerance towards those who exercise that belief. The coins, we have cited, both before and after the battle—that has been said to have marked more of a spiritual than a territorial victory for Constantine—bear the virtue SAPIENTIA and as well the owl of Minerva. The vision, then, did not

[1] Maurice, i. 214; ii. 153.

[2] Huttmann, *The Establishment of Christianity and the Proscription of Paganism*, 1914, 44 ff., gives a useful summary of these interpretations.

displace the goddess. The later syncretisms declare the same spiritual fact. Those notable coins,[1] where the sign—which was said to have been seen in dream at the bridge—appears on the imperial helmet with the stars of the Dioscuri, tell it forth only in other cult terms. We may not lose sight of the fact that the toleration of the Christian religion is as substantial a note in Constantine's history, though embodied in edictal parchments, as the syncretisms on his coins. Just so we cannot say that the former is evidence and the latter is not evidence for his spiritual pilgrimages. What is wanted, in the place of attempts to force both the language of the Edicts and the symbolism of the coins, is a historic means of drawing together the earlier SAPIENTIA[2] and the later *Sophia*, that the two may preserve their exact place in the story of the mind of Constantine. It took him almost the whole length of his reign to go from SAPIENTIA to *Sophia*. Precise and dateable evidence declares that we are bound to admit that slow transition. There is no such evidence for the other part of Batiffol's judgement that up to the time of the *Sophia* period—to keep the language of his own statement—Constantine was 'a convinced Christian.' We can find, on the

[1] Vötter, *Numismatische Zeit.* 1892, Taf. ii. 73 and 75.

[2] Gneichi, *op. cit.* 34, omits *Sapientia* from his *Synoptic Table of Allegorical Personifications*, and Minerva (p. 11) from his *Synoptic View of Gods* for Constantine.

other hand, that the Wisdom which was Minerva served Constantine as a means of intellectual alliance with the *Wisdom* which was Christ. The charity of the Edicts is that of a man for whom the ancient gods have made the paths easy between themselves and the new God. By turning a Latin word into Greek, he becomes bilingual in religion. It is much to be doubted that the experience in him went deeper than that. We shall see [1] that through Lactantius, if in no other way, Constantine could learn about the Christ who was the *Sophia*. That he never reached the Lactantian belief in such a person also will be yet shown. We draw attention here to the historic character of the legend SAPIENTIA PRINCIPIS. It looks like the philosophised goddess for whom Afranius [2] made verses; *Sapientia* whom the Greeks call *Sophia*, the daughter of Minerva and Memoria. The phrase certainly came from the cult of Minerva; but it means in the life of Constantine not a phrase from a sequestered philosophy, nor merely the attribution of a Minervan quality to him; but rather a mode of making the best of both the old and the new world as the general imperial practice, and of gentle progress from SAPIENTIA to *Sophia* as to his private religious belief. The church or 'temple' dedicated to *Irene* was born from an event in his kingdom without him;

[1] *Infra*, ch. viii.

[2] Aulus Gellius, *Noctes*, XIII. viii.

that dedicated to *Sophia* was from a process more than a decade long in the kingdom within him.

Before it is possible to enquire if the information of Socrates is as correct concerning a Constantinian dedication to persons as it is concerning the imperial foundation of churches to impersonals, we should examine some attempts and their causes to establish dedicatory complements to *Irene* and *Sophia*. To reach these, we have to travel onwards in literary history from the time of Socrates to the mediaeval enlargement of the Socratean tradition. This is represented, for example, by Codinus. The opening of his work on the church of *Hagia Sophia*[1] contains a list of churches said to have been founded by Constantine—*Hagia Sophia*; S. Agathonikos; *Hagia Dynamis*, and *Hagia Irene*. A superficial note of advance in this list is, of course, to be found in the adjective *Hagia*. *Sophia* has been thus personalised. She is no longer a virtue, but is the one spoken of in the Sapiential writings who, by the earliest method of the interpretation of Christ and His revelation, became a chief name and meaning for Him. *Irene* is also made a person. From the historical point of view, we know that this list represents a theological rehandling of the Socratean tradition.

[1] *De Structura Templi S. Sophiae*, 130 (ed. Bekker, 1843). Codinus utilises a second tradition as will be shown in an examination of his *De Aedificis*.

There is more than that in the list. The occurrence of the names *Sophia* and *Dynamis* betray the next step in the extension of the tradition of Socrates. When the term *Sophia* was made Christological, then was started the making of dedicatory complements. *Hagia Sophia* demanded its companion *Hagia Dynamis,* since the two are inseparable names in the earliest mode of disclosing the meanings of the nature and work of Jesus Christ.[1] We are not now laying bare a slow

[1] Harris and Burch, *Testimonies*, ii. 67, etc. Cp. for ancient Christological use of the Sophia: Melchior, *Concilium Antiochenum* (ed. Routh), iii. 299; *Acta Concil. Antioch.* iii. 310; Dionysius Rom. iii. 375; Dionysius Alex. *Ep. ad Dionys. Rom.*, *Frag.* i. (iii. 390); *Frag.* vii. (iii. 397); Origen, *Comm. in Joan.* i. 11; (*P.G.* xiv. 41*a*), i. 17 (53*a*), i. 22 (56*b*-57*b*), i. 39 (89 *c-d*), i. 42 (101*c-d* and 104*a*), ii. 4 (121*a*), ii. 6 (133*b*), xxx. ii. 18 (817*c*); *Expositio in Proverbia*, 9, i. (*P.G.* xvii. 185*b*), 9. 3 (185*c*), 16. 16 (196*a*); Hippolytus, *Frag. in Genesin*, *P.G.* x. 596*b*, *Frag. in Proverbia*, 622*d*, 625*d*; Pamphilus, *Apologia pro Origine*, *Praef.* (Routh, iv. 344), iii. (iii. 354); Gregory Thaum. *Fidei Expositio*, *P.G.* x. 1105*d* (among *Dubia*); Eusebius, *De Laud. Const.* xii. (*P.G.* xx. 1389*b*), xv. (1421*a*); *Eclog. Proph.* iii. i. (*P.G.* xxii. 1121), *Comm. in Ps.* xxiii. (24), 1-2 (*P.G.* xxiii. 220*c*), xlviii. 4-5 (429*c*), lxiii. 2-3 (616*c*), lxxi. 1-2 (792 *a-b*), lxxxv. 10 (1036*b*), lxxxix. 2 (1128*c*), xclii. 1 (1185*c*), cvi. 5 (1321*b*); *Demonstratio Evang.* iv. 2 (*P.G.* xxii. 253*a*), iv. 5 (260*c*), iv. 10 (280*b*), v. 1 (349*a*), v. 3 (361*b*), v. 5 (376*b*), v. 8 (381*a*), v. 19 (400*a*), v. 29 (409*a*), vi. *Prooem.* (412*c*), vi. 10 (428*b*), x. *Prooem.* (716*b*), x. 1. (721*c*), *Praeparatio Evang.* vii. 12 (*P.G.* xxi. 541*b*), vii. 15 (549*a*), vii. 14 (884*b*), *Hist. Eccl.* i. 2 (*P.G.* xx. 53 B.*f.*)—certain minor works concerning which there is critical controversy, I have not included: Athanasius, *Apologia ad Const.* 17 (*P.G.* xxv. 616*c*); *Orats. contra Arianos*, i. 19 (*P.G.* xxvi. 52*b*), i. 28 (69*b*), ii. 2 (149*b*), ii. 5 (157*b*), ii. 39 (229*b*),

mental movement on the part of Constantine, from an imperial or semi-divine quality called VIRTUS[1] to a shadowy Christian abstraction called *Dynamis* —an analogous change with SAPIENTIA and *Sophia*. The adjective marks that the hagiographic complement is a creation later than his time. A theological mind has been at work, and Constantine's had not that quality. Moreover, that theologically-minded person has been pressed to shape his list as he has by historical events. In a letter written by Alexius III.[2] to accompany certain benefits conferred on Constantinople, is the phrase ' the sacred temple of *Hagia Dynamis*.' An examination of authoritative and dateable calendars of Greek saints previous to the date of the letter, which is 1202,[3] produces no saint with

ii. 44 (241*b*), ii. 47 (245*d*), ii. 49 (252*b*), ii. 62 (277*c*), ii. 77 (312*a*), ii. 79 (313*c*), ii. 80 (317*a*), iii. 1 (324*c*), iii. 10 (341*b* and 341*c*), iii. 51 (432*a*), iii. 52 (433 *a-b*), iii. 65 (461*a*) ; *De Synodis*, 15 (700*b*), 39 (764*a*), 41 (765*a*), 42 (763*a*) ; *De Trin. et Spiritu Sancto*, 18 (1211*d*) ; *Ep.* x. 4 (1399) ; Ps. Athanasius, *Exp. in Ps. ciii.* vv. 24-25 (*P.G.* xxvii. 440*d*). These are references on the Greek side of Patristics and down to about the time of Constantine. The Latin side offers an equally impressive witness. Much greater place must be given to this *Sophia* concept in our histories of Christian thought, for in that and some associated names is the origin of Christology both as history and idea.

[1] Maurice, II. cxix. ff. 217 ff. *C.I.L.* viii. 1626.

[2] Miklosich and Müller, *Acta et Diplomata Res Graecas Italasque Illustrantia*, 1865, iii. 52.

[3] Cp. Heyd, *Le Colonie Commerciali degli Italiani in Oriente nel Medio Evo*, 1866, 79 f.

that name.[1] The building must have been put up before Alexius wrote his letter—that is between the time of the Constantinopolitan Menologion, which belongs to the beginning of the eleventh century, and the writing of Alexius' letter, which belongs to the beginning of the thirteenth century. It is easy to see how the inspiration to make a *Hagia Dynamis* sprang from the presence of a *Hagia Sophia*, and as easy to follow how the first came to share in the latter's ascription to Constantine the Great. Let the Christological valuation be given to the *Sophia* foundation which was Constantine's, it will come about that should the *Dynamis* concept in that valuation become memorialised in a building and cult, its beginnings will be ascribed to the emperor who was the first of the great line of imperial benefactors of the Church, and as well the alleged establisher of that Christology in the Byzantine empire. Hence, Codinus in his writing on the church of *Hagia Sophia*, where he extends the list of Socrates, instead of following the older tradition composed a pair of hagiographic complements—the first of which is *Hagia Sophia* and *Hagia Dynamis*—and naturally placed them under the name of Constantine as founder.

[1] *e.g.* The Alban Calendar of about the eighth century. Morcelli, *Kalendarium Eccl. Constant.* 1788, ii. 218, and the Constantinopolitan Menologion, edited by Scholz; *De Menologiis Duorum Codicum Graecarum Bibl. Regiae Parisiensis*, 1823, cf. the very early eleventh century, severally know nothing of such a saint.

The second pair of complements is not so apparent as the first; for a saint is paired with *Irene*. The composition of that saint's name, Agathonikos, reveals the first reason for its companionship with the gentler abstraction; that is to say, the saint for the purposes of the list in Codinus, is a personalised *Nike* or Victory.[1] This suggestion covers two kinds of considerations, the broad one that Constantine never dedicated a place of worship to any person, and especially to no saint; and the particular one that is concerned with the reasons why the extension of the Socratean tradition was carried out. The first or broad consideration is best answered by finding the structural details of the enlargement. We must introduce, at this juncture, the Sozomenian tradition,[2] with its short list of foundations by Constantine: *Irene*, the Apostles Church, and S. Mocius. Even the fifth century lists, short though they are, have their

[1] Coins of Constantine bear the legend LAETA VICTORIA (Maurice, II. cxxiv. and 335), but there is not good reason for supposing that a temple in contrast with that to *Irene* was raised to celebrate the conquest of Licinius.

[2] Bidez, *La Tradition Manuscrite de Sozomène et la Tripartite de Théodore le Lecteur*, 1908, 61 and 35 ff., with III. for the extension of the Sozomen tradition through Theodore the Lector to Leo Grammaticus. Agathonikos has very little substance as a man; cp. *Vita in Acta SS.*, xxxviii. 522 ff. and *Oratio in Sanctum Agathonicum* by Philotheus Selymbriensis, who transmutes that very little into shadow and figures from Homer and Aeschylus. Cp. Sarrazin, *De Theodore Lectore*, 165 ff. (*Commentationes Philol. Ianenses*, 1881, 1).

variations; and where the dedications to persons occur. Are there clear reasons why Mocius should have been given a place in a list of Constantinian foundations?

Three reasons leap to the eye when his *Martyrium*[1] is studied. 1. He is said to be a Diocletian martyr; 2. He triumphs over the pagan gods by the use of the 'sign of Christ' (*signum Christi*); 3. His place in the later Graeco-Slav calendars of saints. These reasons are reinforced as soon as the extended Sozomenian tradition is examined. Cedrenus[2] enumerates the following: Hagia Sophia, Hagia Irene, Apostles, S. Mocius and S. Agathonikos. The personalised *Nike* is included with Mocius. Some justification as a dedication might have been found even for the first if the second could be shown to have historicity as a Constantinian church. There is no agreement amongst the witnesses as to who was the founder of S. Mocius.[3] The anonymous author of the *Antiquitates*[4] preserves a list of Socratean length, but he cuts out Mocius and gives Agathonikos an Isaac for his fellow. While Codinus in his *De Aedificis*[5] writes down an extended composite

[1] *Acta SS.* xv. 620 ff., *sub* May 11.

[2] *Hist. Comp.* i. 496 (ed. Bekker, 1838).

[3] Cp. Gyllius, *De topographia Constp.* iv. viii. in Banduri, *Imp. Orientalis*, 1729, i. iii. 327.

[4] *Antiq. Constp.* iv. 183 in Banduri, i. iii. 57.

[5] 71*c* (ed. Bekker, 1843).

list, from both Socrates and Sozomen traditions, thus: Hagia Irene, Hagia Sophia, S. Agathonikos, S. Acacius and the Apostles Church; wherein a new name Acacius ousts Mocius and Isaac. There must be some similar literary motive at work to cause these comings and goings of names. What it is can be concluded after the list given in Nicephorus Callistus [1] is enunciated: Hagia Sophia, Hagia Irene, Hagia Dynamis, S. Acacius, S. Agathonikos, S. Menas. Therein this historian has made the same combination as Codinus, but on a larger scale. Having died in 1327, Nicephorus was subsequent to the foundation of S. Dynamis; therefore that Church finds its place in the Constantinian list for the same reasons as its first appearance in Byzantine history where it treated of Constantine. S. Isaac has been displaced by S. Menas. It is possible that Menas should be in those texts where the name Mocius occurs, for the latter seems to be a problematical person.[2] Or if that name stands, as perhaps it should, on the authority of the Alban Calendar, we come to the same conclusion as that stated above. What literary motive creates these lists?

The answer is in summary in the points from the *Martyrium Mocii*. Before modern historians had begun to dispose of Constantine as pro- or anti-

[1] *H.E.* vii. 49.

[2] See Martinov, *Acta SS.* lix. 167. For the traditional views, Ciampini, *De Sacris Aedificis*, 1693, 165.

Diocletian, the chroniclers in the Middle Age had represented him as reverencing those whom Diocletian had killed. Secondly, that such objects of remorse were chosen because the narrative of their martyrdoms offered certain superficial relations with accepted material or events in the Constantine-Silvester literature. Thirdly, the changes of names in the lists of these mediaeval writers were due to their propinquity in the calendar of the saints. These three reasons interpret the three points from the narrative about Mocius. We have now to enquire for their support in the narratives of those who are either alternative or collocative names in the lists which have been cited.

This pro-Diocletianism, of those who write lives or lists of the saints that Constantine might be credited with them, is seen in the instances of Acacius[1] and Isaac of Tiphre.[2] Both suffer martyrdom at the hands of Diocletian. The story of the first opens with the Dragon motive,[3] now in the diabolic figure of a persecutor; whilst the story of Isaac is dominated by an Arianus,[4] a governor who by his strange methods under-

[1] *P.G.* cxv. 217*c*. For alleged relations with Byzantium, 237*d*.

[2] Budge, ed. Coptic, *Martyrium* in *Trans. of the Soc. of Bibl. Archaeology*, 1893, 76.

[3] This feature does not appear in the Armenian *Homily* viii. by Severianus, bishop of Emesa, see ed. by Aucher, *Severiani sive Seberiani*, 1827, 294 ff.

[4] Budge, *op. cit.* 99 etc.

takes to teach Isaac to worship other gods. The temptation to make the governor into Arius, or a follower of his, was evidently irresistible to the compilers of Constantinian narratives, wherein there was need to retrieve the Nicomedian conquest of Constantine by Eusebius the Arian bishop. There is some appreciable irony, though perhaps without design, in making the Nicomedian persecutions of Diocletian serve the purposes of the retrieval. In the instance of Menas, there is no reference to Diocletian, but a short prefatory passage has been added to his story which attempts to make the baptism of Constantine a Christian rite. An examination of this prologue shows that it has literary part in the tissue of the Martyrium. One feature in the writing, and integral to the account of the miracles of Menas, is the story of what he did for Sophia,[1] who was a rich man's wife and childless. This Sophia incident is the linking factor with the Constantine-Silvester literature. The Sophia concept as something in the religion of Constantine became, in the course of time, a saint with three daughters. We have seen

[1] *MSS. Adds. British Museum*, 26, 114, fol. 2A 1 f; a twelfth century codex. I have been unable to see Powjalovskij's edition of Διήγησις Τιμοθέου (1900), from a Moscow MS. of the eleventh century, of which the British Museum MS. is a version. For an analysis of the miracle in the Moscow MS., see De la Haye, *L'Invention des Reliques de S. Ménas à Constantinople*, 1910, 4 and 31. A Latin version is in Lippomanus-Surius, vi. 77*b*, together with the Constantine prologue.

how Theodelinda, the Langobardian queen, took them over with other alleged Constantinian relics. The rich woman in the Menas story passed over into the Saint Sophia [1] of the Constantine story, and from their union came the necessity to add a prologue to the *Martyrium*. These things we have brought out from the various narratives are live ends to the compilers of Constantine-Silvester literature and traditions to be brought into union with live ends presented by their material—that is to say, the names or persons or things which

[1] That this Sophia with her daughters Faith, Hope and Charity are creations from the *Sophia* concept, is to be found by examining the *Sophia Hymn* in the Syriac *Acta Thomae* (ed. Wright, 1871, ii. 151). This *Hymn*, following the Sapiential account, makes *Sophia* a Virgin, and it gives with Oriental richness, the account of her nuptials. A corrupt line in the middle of the *Hymn* tells how a 'censer is ready in the midst of her bridal chamber, Faith, Hope and Charity.' What the poet originally referred to was a 'company' or 'retinue of virgins' was there. The following verses speak of her attendant groomsmen. The virgins are wanted to balance them, and to accompany their names which the inexact Syriac has kept. The parallel to this *Hymn* is in the Syriac story of Sophia and her daughters who were martyred by Hadrian (Lewis, *Select Narratives of Holy Women*, *Studia Sinaitica*, 1910, x. 168 ff.). The editress of this story (p. xxiv) has suggested that it is an allegory of the Divine Wisdom. This, by comparison with the *Hymn*, has been shown to be true. Moreover, the beauty of the three virgins is borrowed from *Wisd.* vii. 25 ff. Both *Hymn* and *Narrative* are Syriac creations. The Greek *Acta Thomae* contains a different and later version of the former. It should be noted that attempts to make the *Hymn* a Gnostic document, *e.g.* Preuschen, *Zwei Gnostische Hymnen*, 1904, 25 ff. are misinterpretations.

figure prominently in the myths about Constantine. This method is that which gave us the whole of the Constantine literature, with the exception of the first material of the lost *Vita*. Thence came the fundamental filiative ends and process which made that literature.

The final reference to a dedication unto persons is in the attribution to Constantine of the foundation of the church to the Apostles. This instance enables us to bring the findings we have just made from the condition of conjecture into that of certitude. We know that the relics of certain Apostles, Andrew, Luke and Timothy, were said to have been brought to Constantinople in 356-357.[1] One of our best authorities for this date is in the several writings which have gathered about the name of S. Artemius.[2] Now Menas comes into the Artemius literature,[3] and is credited

[1] It is most doubtful that Eusebius, *Vita Const.* iv. 58, has any reference to the founding of a church of the Apostles in the original text, cp. ed. Heikel, 1902, note *ad loc.* As early as Socrates, *H.E.* i. 16, the confusion between father and son had been made. The mediaeval chroniclers, of course, preserved it—till Codinus (73 and 146) ascribed the foundation to Helena and Constantine. To the usual late sources add the poem of Constantine the Rhodian and Nicholas Mesarites, i. etc. The evident doubt of Zonaras, *Annal.* xiv. 7 (*P.G.* cxxxiv. 1217*c*) is in contrast with other chroniclers of the Middle Age.

[2] *Passio S. Artemii*, 16 (Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum*, 1840, iv. 352); *Passio*, 9, *P.G.* xcvi. 1260*b*; *Martyrium*, iii. *P.G.* cxv. 1164*b*. See also *Chron. Pasch.* and Idatius *ad ann.*

[3] Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Varia Graeca Sacra*, 1909, 17 ff.

with being a personage in the days of Heraclius. Then Menas, coming through Artemius into the complex of the Constantian literature, could not have achieved that feat until after the accounts of Artemius had been written. Both facts concerning this literary relationship make him post-Constantinian. Further, the first extant records of Menas in Greek hagiological lists are in the eleventh century Greek calendar and in the thirteenth century Graeco-Slav *Menologion* analysed by Assemanus.[1] There, too, Constantine and Helena appear—though not for the first time. They have no other companions, in that list, save Irene (May 5), out of the saints Constantine has been said to have honoured. There is an Andronicus (Oct. 12) in it and in the eleventh century Calendar; and an anonymous writer in a text, called *Narratio de structura templi S. Sophiae*,[2] appears to be the only authority who has adopted that name with *Sophia* to represent the two churches founded by the emperor. He may have relied on the Graeco-Slav list for that name.[3] No theoretical reconstruction of Constantine has

[1] *Kalendaria Eccl. Universae*, 1755, i. 101 ff.

[2] Ed. by Combefis, *Originum Rerumque Constantp.* 1664, 243.

[3] The eleventh century Calendar (ed. Scholz, 7) has, as we have seen, the two names. It may be expected that the writer of the *Narrative* would lean on the document nearer in date to himself. The historians like Nicephorus Callistus did not go about Constantinople and from topographical information compile their lists of Constantinian foundations.

credited him with the foresight which could tell what saints might come into his city in varied literary manners, and he cannot be held responsible for the compilative ingenuity of those who should write him up—especially for the elaborate ingenuity of late Mediaeval writers. Nicephorus is after the date of the Graeco-Slav Menologion, and he is our authority for S. Menas as a church founded by Constantine. The mode and time of his entrance upon such a position in the emperor's regard are surely made out.

The problem of how the cult of the Apostles in any sense came to be associated with Constantine is answerable from two sides: 1. From the prominence given to the vision of Peter and Paul in the myth of his baptism in blood. 2. From another phase of Silvester literature where Timothy is the chief personage involved. The *Vita Sylvestri*, edited by Combefis,[1] displays its fusion with the *Acta S. Timothei*. There could not be clearer evidence how Constantine had been turned into an enthusiast for the memories of the Apostles. We know that what was alleged of Silvester was emphatically affirmed of Constantine. The apocryphal appearance of an Apostle in the *Vita Sylvestri* has meant an ancient church, dedicated to the Apostles, realistically ascribed to Constantine's generosity. Two other aids to ease the

[1] *Illustrium Christi Martyrum*, 1660, 260; *A.S.S.* xxxviii. 534*d*, and cp. 533*c*.

moving back of the foundation of the Church to the emperor are in the Artemius literature and in the historical allegation that his son raised the church and buried therein Constantine and Helena. Artemius is made a Constantinian saint by the ascription of a church to his memory, and he it was who brought the apostolic relics to Constantinople. The *Vita Sylvestri* plays the minor part of preparing the way for this temporal transference by associating the pope with the Apostle Timothy. That Constans should have honoured the Apostles and his relations is an act so near to the life of Constantine that the son's deeds form, as it were, a slipway to ease further the backward movement of Time. The consequent clustering of a number of saintly names, for the reasons we have found, about the apostolic figures was an almost necessary process. Those whom Artemis did not sweep in with him,[1] Diocletian's name or filiated Constantinian myth, were able to bear on even stronger tides into the complex of Constantine-Silvester literature. History, however, establishes the simple truth that the emperor raised no churches to persons.

This conclusion raises two dependent problems—was the *Sophia* foundation to a person or virtue? and was the notice of the *Liber Pontificalis* where, for instance, the basilicae of Paul and Peter are

[1] There is, for example, an Acacius story among the *Thaumata* of Artemius, Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *op. cit.* 10.

said to have been founded by him fundamentally false? The *Sophia* problem demands its own chapter, but that raised by the lists of the Popes is ancillary to the allegation of a Constantinian Church of the Apostles in Constantinople. Neither Andrew, Luke nor Timothy is Paul or Peter. Nor is there any apostolic Peter or Paul cult in Constantinople to be associated with Constantine's name. The first of the Apostles in old Rome has no place in new Rome. His figure moves very filmily across only two pages of the earlier Constantine-Silvester literature. Some little density of substance appears to be lent to that shade when we reach the thirteenth century, and the *Historia Constantinopolitana* of Guntherus of Paris;[1] but by making the vision of Peter and Paul and Constantine's leprosy to be historic facts. The motive of the apocryphal Silvester literature is borrowed and used at the direction of history compounded from its myths. As to Paul in Constantinople, he is represented by a namesake,[2] a Paulus who had been bishop in the city,[3] and whom Photius associates with Constantine. A Constantinopolitan tradition strong enough to credit him with a cult for the Apostles could, by the agency of a

[1] Riant, *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, 1877, i. 96. Cp. also Zonaras, *Annal.* xiii. 2 (1101*b*).

[2] Photius, *P.G.* cclvii. 120*d* ff.; *Vita S. Pauli*, *P.G.* cxvi. 884*a* ff. Cp. Riant, i. 141 f.

[3] Gams, *sub* Constantp. *ann.* 344-352.

Paulus who had been ordained in the *Irene*[1] Church, cause a confluent tradition in Rome—when it was reinforced by the Roman intent to Silvesterise Constantine. What the emperor did not in new Rome he regarded not in old Rome; and when myth gave him credit for benefactions in Constantinople he would not have made, that same most powerful agent created the analogies of manners and dedications in worship for Constantine in Rome. The polemical reasons for such matters are plain. We have to disclose their modes of literary creation. Our investigations have led to several general conclusions. There is among them, however, one that belongs peculiarly to this subject of the attribution of churchly deeds to Constantine; the pagan cult tradition in the lost *Vita Constantini* is a Roman product which appeared later in Constantinople, whilst the ecclesiastical tradition connected with the emperor's name is a Constantinopolitan product; since its Roman side was made in imitation of the mythical account of what he actually did in Constantinople. Archaeology joins with literary criticism to declare that the entries concerning dedications in the notice of Silvester, contained in the *Liber Pontificalis*, are not true. Constantine had no regard for Peter, and as little for

[1] This feature is mentioned (Photius, 121*a*) to emphasise how naturally such a Paulus would find his place in the group of saints said to have been reverenced by Constantine.

Paul.[1] The lack of historicity in the accounts of his contact with Pope Silvester is balanced by the nature of his religion. From the time of the conquest of Rome some segments of it found a personal reference, and that was in himself.[2] The other segments sought slowly towards the Christian modes of thought. Christology adds its voice to the voices of Archaeology and literary criticism to assert that Constantine did not dedicate churches to persons. His mind was never held even by the historic Christ.

[1] It is interesting to find that in literature like the fifteenth century *Indulgentia eccles. principalium alme Urbis Romae* (British Museum, two copies, I A 17621 and C 9 *a* 22, dated ? 1475), after a short introduction saying that in the *Chronica* written by Silvester hundreds of churches were destroyed; it goes on to enumerate the seven chief churches, Lateran, etc. without ascribing any to Constantine; and when the church in Jerusalem is reached, its foundation is ascribed to 'Constantina filia Constantini.' For this type of writing, if it is not actually the same, see Panzer, *Annales Typographici*, iv. 146.

[2] Preger, *Hermes*, 1901, 458 ff.

VII

CONSTANTINE AND THE CONVOCATION OF THE JEWISH DISPUTANTS

THERE are two other factors, than those we have found already, which formed the Constantine-Silvester literature: the empress Helena and early Christian apologetical books. She who began by calling her son to the Jewish faith,[1] ended by being converted through the potencies of primitive *Anti-Judaica*. The ancient world of Romulus and Claudius was called in to redress the faults of Constantine's birth, and the new world of Christianity to ennoble and canonise Helena. This latter process has issued in an appendix to the *Vitae Constantini et Sylvestri*, that is larger than they. Appendices have a swift inevitability of growth—even more so than Mrs. Stowe's Topsy—in that world where obscure beginnings have to enrobe themselves with unearthly light that the end might be worthy. To accomplish this purpose, sometimes strange things are done. The inherent vitality of the material which has been

[1] *e.g. Legenda*, fol. 8 *a* f. and 21 *b*-22 *a*.

appropriated for that purpose, or the liveliness of the imagination and art of the appropriators, will determine whether there is a luxurious or sparse addition to the first nucleus of fact or fancy. Constantine and Helena seem determined that students of their literature should not be wearied by lack of surprises concerning their sources and their art of literary marquetry. This specimen, in the long legend of the Convocation of the Jewish disputants, is a 'pocket' of the unexpected.

It covers many pages; its gist can soon be told. The emperor is eager to do theological battle for the Christian faith. Therefore he and Silvester determine to call together in Rome the principal apologists of Judaism. Helena, from Bithynia, attempts to dissuade Constantine. He prevails on her to attend. The legend gives with much detail the to and fro of the debate, in which the dialectic of Constantine and Silvester is too powerful for the Rabbis. Debate being of no avail, a final test is carried out by the raising from the dead of a bull. Helena is baptised as a result of what she hears and sees. Thus told it is a simple tale. It is not the first of its sort that hides artistic guile.

This debate has its named *dramatis personae*, for besides Constantine and Silvester, whose parts are distinctly marked, there are Zambres (Mic. vi. 16), Abiathar, Jonas the Rabbi, Godolias, Aunan (*Num.* xvi. 1), Doek (2 *Kings*, xxi. 7),

Kousek, Tharra and Simeon, etc. A superficial glance at such a list of Jewish names reveals their origin. The Septuagint has been ransacked for names, without any regard to relationship between them ; though for the most part, it will be noticed, the names are of those who have something to do with the work of prophecy. Two or three references have been placed after the names just to mark their presence in the book ; and it should be noted that Jonah has been made a rabbi according to the method of a playwright. Thus we are certain that the Convocation has not more history in it than its opening which tells of the emperor's fervour after he had been baptised by Silvester. How the idea of this gathering came to be will manifest itself after we have looked into the material of the debate, and when we have turned to ask how it became associated with the empress Helena.

The subject of the discussion is the Person of Christ and Christology ; it is the material used in the discussion that gives the legend its value. When we examine this material we find it to consist of what appears to be the disparate use of citations from the Old Testament and Sapiential writings, which are cemented together by short glosslike remarks concerning them. For a new convert Constantine is found to be possessed of a very ready and confident Christological argument coupled with a rather overbearing Augustan

manner, whilst Silvester as befits a pope has at his command this extraordinary series of excerpts which, though the members have little apparent relationship with one another, is bound together by a closely knit argument that betokens some literary source with context and matter to fill in its interstices. The gentlest way of describing the situation is that both emperor and pope are exhibited as scholarly folk.

For the source which has been used in this dramatic dialogue candidly reveals itself without recondite research. Let us choose one of the several of its published texts—for example, that in Cedrenus [1]—and compare it with the chief work of one who was a tutor in Constantine's court, Lactantius; and the greater part of the problem concerning the Convocation is solved. It is worth while going through some weariness from detailed analysis to reach any results. Therefore we will deal with the Constantine-Silvester document and Lactantius in a tabular fashion.

The Cedrenus or shortened [2] version of the debate preserves thirty-two citations. Their analogies, except in certain instances, are to be found in the fourth book of Lactantius' *Diuinarum*

[1] *Hist. Comp. P.G.* cxxi. 521 *c* ff.; cp. George the Monk, *Chronicon*, iv. clxxix.

[2] This description is due to a comparison of Cedrenus and the *Legenda*.

Institutionum. The proof of this conclusion is to be seen thus :

Constantine-Silvester Document.	Lactantius, *Div. Inst.*
1. Ps. xxxii. 6.	iv. 8. 10.
2. Ps. ii. 7, conflated with Luke, iii. 22. This is done twice within twenty lines of the Greek text.	iv. 15. 3.
3. Gen. i. 26.	ii. 10. 3.
4. Ps. lxxxviii. 27.	Not in Lactantius.
5. Ps. l. 13.	Not in Lactantius.
6. Ps. xxxii. 6.	iv. 18. 14.
7. Ps. vii. 14.	iv. 12. 4.
8. Baruch, iii. 36-37.	iv. 13. 8.
9. Zech, iii. 1-2.	iv. 14. 6-9.
10. Sap. Sol. ii. 12.	iv. 16. 7-10.

These ten instances are sufficient to display all the critical conclusions which are possible from an analysis of the document of the Convocation. The three phases to a judgment deducible from the above table are at once to be perceived : 1. The coincidence of the greatest part of the material between the document and Lactantius iv. ; 2. The inclusion of one excerpt in the prefatory portion of Lactantius' work ; 3. The inclusion of some citations in the document which are not in the eloquent philosopher's book. These analogues could be looked upon as coincidences—if we did not know very much about the sources of Lac-

tantius, and were unaware of the intriguing fact of his relations with Constantine. Our present knowledge of the apologist throws all the light we can desire on the Constantinian apocryphon. We shall reach the confirmation of that statement by examining in some detail the triple facets of that conclusion which could cause us to waver between coincidence and suggestion of source. As tests of this critical position we will choose for the first phase, instances 2, 8 and 10 ; for the second phase, instance 3 ; and for the third phase, instances 4 and 5.

The conflation of the second psalm with Luke, which is our first illustration, is an ancient tradition in a singular order of Christian writings. It does not mean that a reminiscence of the Gospel narrative of the baptism of Jesus Christ has become indissolubly attached to the verse from the Psalms—there would be nothing distinctive, such as we have claimed, in that origin. And the possible argument for its naturalness goes away when we know that it originated in primitive Christian *Anti-Judaica*—a representative of which order of Christian literature is to be seen in Justin's *Trypho*. In sections 88 and 122 [1] of that *Dialogue* the second century writer uses the citation from the second Psalm with this noteworthy conjunction of Luke ; but not in the uninspired manner of a reminiscential attachment of a phrase of the Gospel

[1] *P.G.* vi. 688 *b* and 760 *d*.

narrative to a verse from the Psalter. Justin's usage is a borrowed one; it was created by an argument older than himself for Jesus Christ as *The Son*. The controversial motive of that argument is vividly maintained in the Convocation legend; for it was the anti-Judaic presentation of the meanings and facts of Jesus Christ.[1] The reason for the dramatic inertia of the Convocation document lies in that fact—since no one can expect the impression of living movement from a narrative which takes big pieces of a Christological document, composed of excerpts from canonical books of the Old Testament, and spills some Hebraic names among them. Even Constantine and Silvester are automata, as their words and rôles show. The usage of this conflated passage in Lactantius and the Convocation document is exactly of the same sort as in Justin; though in the former there is annexed to that ancient usage some touches of later Trinitarian thought. This also was the way the primitive Christological argument went; that is to say, it moved from its earliest absorption in the interpretation of who and what Christ was, to become an explanation of who and what He was in the scheme of conciliar theology. The chief point to seize is that the conflated excerpt is from the ancient *Anti-Judaica* of the early Church, and that it is so used in the

[1] For a full statement on this order of literature, see the chapter on *Constantine and Oratory*.

Convocation document. Our second illustration has to do with the use of a piece from Baruch. Lactantius cites it as coming from *Hieremias*.[1] The philosopher was copying his source, whilst the compiler of the Convocation dialogue corrected it by writing, ' Baruch prophesying.' Both writers keep the point that makes this prophetic citation significant—namely that this Baruch or Jeremiah passage was turned to enforce the anti-Judaic idea that Christ was God and man. The third illustration takes us into the *Wisdom of Solomon*, ii.[2] Again both Lactantius and the document agree in the distinctive interpretative qualities given to this Sapiential excerpt—an inheritance from the earliest times of Christian thought. These qualities are : its anti-Judaism and its traditional selection as a passage to explain who it was that had come upon the earth to live and to be tempted. The choice of such a passage proves a motive that lies deeper than identity and usage in two different writers. Moreover, the strictly literal parallel to the language of the Convocation document, prefatory to the use of this excerpt, is to be seen in the

[1] For same designation, see, *e.g.*, Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* iv. 34, 4; Evagrius, *Altercatio*, i. 6 (*P.L.* xx. 1167 *d*); *Dialogue Athanasius and Zaccheus*, 24 (ed. Conybeare, *Anecdota Oxon.* viii. 19); Harris and Burch, i. 49.

[2] We are only beginning to understand the influence of this great chapter on the mind of Paul, because of its use by Jesus Christ, see my *S. Paul et le Christianisme fondamental*, 1924, ch. ii. etc.

ancient Spanish version of this earliest Christological primer, which was known to Isidore of Seville.[1] Therefore, the glosslike accompaniments of the citations also belong to a tradition prior to Lactantius and Isidore and the Constantine document.

The two other phases of our test yield their answers without the detailed treatment of the first. That certain of the excerpts from the ancient Christological sources were worked into the earlier portions of Lactantius' book is one of the results of the recent study of the apologist. That their companions were Sibylline and Apolline material in no way takes us from that source, for as it has been shown in the study referred to, this ancient source in certain of its versions had selected some such oracular material.[2] Again, that certain others of the excerpts should not be found in Lactantius is another point in favour of their common or ancient source, since Lactantius chose, as the Constantine document does, what from it he should include or exclude. Both these phases, then, have the same purpose and quality in their choice—the interpretation of Jesus Christ according to the primal anti-Judaism of His revelation. The Constantine document sets these things in an ambitious dramatic framework that is fundamentally

[1] Isid. Hisp., *De Fide Catholica contrà Judaeos*, I. xxiii. (*P.L.* lxxxiii. 479 *b-c*).

[2] Burch, *op. cit.* and chiefly Appendix to ch. iv.

anti-Judaic. The compiler's skill was not enough to make his figures live and their speech do other than reveal whence he had quarried his matter. From the point of view of the student of evidence for Constantine, he could have done no more satisfactory work ; from that of the student of literature he foredoomed his work to lack of charm. He would not please Longinus ; but he would delight Timaeus the Sicilian.

This disclosure of a literary source altogether different from the Romano-Sabine one, which hitherto has held our eyes, raises the question whether the Convocation document manifests any thread which could radically relate it to that pagan source. It will be remembered that, in our epitome of the document, we were told how it contained the incident of the raising of a bull from the dead. This was a test of the power of the God whom Constantine and Silvester had argumentatively made victor over their opponents. The animal came to life through Silvester's invocation of the name of Christ, whilst Zambres failed though he whispered the name of God in the ear of the bull. That is to say Zambres[1] here represents the Etruscan or Sabine mode using the divine name for magical purposes in contrast with the Christian mode. Nearly ninety years ago, Wilhelm Grimm, when editing the Middle German poem on Silvester by Conrad of Würzburg, suggested that here, in

[1] *e.g. Legenda*, fol. 17 *b* 1 *f.*

the poet's setting of the Convocation legend, was a strain of Etruscan ritual. Lactantius Placidus, in his commentary on Statius,[1] tells how in that religion the name of God had to be kept from pollution ; therefore when it was to be used it could only be murmured in the ear. We suppose, then, that in the lost *Vita Constantini* there must have been an incident, or incidents, in which this Sabine ritual was described, and most probably in relation to the separated members of the community who simulated death to denote the fact of their devotion to its God. Perhaps they would be brought back from wolfhood to manhood by the whispering of the divine name in their ears. There must have been some ritual act of restoration. In this Convocation incident, it has become assimilated to the Jews, so that the anti-Judaism of Constantine and Silvester merges in the general anti-Sabinism of the literature which was created about them. The bull is not introduced to increase the ritual fauna of Soracte, or of the Roman hill-sites unto which the Sabine Apollo came. It may be conjectured that it is an item to unite with the prayer ascribed to Silvester, at the close of this test of the powers of Christ's name ;[2] which leads to the conjecture that the compiler of the

[1] *Theb.* iv. 516 (ed. Jahnke, 1898, iii. 229) ; cp. Grimm. *op. cit.* xx.

[2] *Legenda*, fol. 19*a* f. Silvester has adopted Elisha's prayer with its triple invocation of God in the names of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and tinctured it with a little Trinitarianism.

Convocation legend was here feeling the influence of the Old Testament story where Elijah overcame the priests of Baal. He must have expressed a sense of irony in muting, their loud cries unto the god who slept, to the Etruscan murmuring in the ear of the animal which they could never awaken. Both mountain-shrine and a god that was overthrown might also be literary reasons why the bull was introduced into the Convocation legend; for the first reason calls up *Soracte* and the Capitoline hill in the original *Vita Constantini*, and the second reason evokes the apologetic motive for the compilation of the legend. We can come nearer than this to reasons why the narrative of the bull finds its place in this Convocation story.

Among the names of those who take part in the Christological controversy are two borne by persons who have a special rôle given to them. Their names are Craton and Zenophilus or Xenophilus, and they do not contend as those whose names are from the Old Testament, for they are called 'judges' (judices).[1] Their office could perhaps be said to have a remote Jewish air about it, but their names

[1] *Legenda*, fol. 16 *a* 2 and 18 *b* 2 twice; fol. 14 *a* 2 Zenophilus is described as 'judex.' Cp. also names in the separately printed text of the story—Vincelius, *Disputatio Christianorum et Judaeorum*, 1544. This sixteenth century Bohemian edition has an introduction in which Vincelius takes part in contemporary dispute with Jewish scholars in a manner that surpasses the Constantinian arrogance: "frustra etiam me projecturum fuisse margaritas meas ante porcos." (*pg.* 13 ff.).

do not lend support to that view of its rise. Nothing of consequence is involved in the exact placing of this description, for it is treated as closely as we need if we see in the foreign-looking name and the conventional part, a foretaste of the mediaeval mystery-plays. The names must have had a source. Those of their companions in discussion had their rise in a source that was germane to the whole motive of the apocryphon. Our conclusions have led us to find that in this writing there is a nuclear use of Romanised Sabine ritual. Now these practices must have had their reference to site. We will test, then, for the influence of site on the composition of the Convocation myth.

Next to Constantinople there is no other local name as well known as that of the Golden Horn. For most people, it conjures up a scene of sun-lit waters lapping the foundations of white minaretted buildings which reach to a cloudless sky. Since the time, let us say, of Hesychius, for others the site is one that is lovely with old stories which take them back through the greater Greek playwrights to the unyoked poetry of narratives told, from father to son, by the cattle-men on the shores of the Bosphorus. These stories had their visible monument in the seventh region [1] of Constantinople, which was known as the Place of the Bull. There they crystallised themselves, as it

[1] *Descriptio Urbis Constp. sub* Regio vii. a description of the city in the time of Arcadius.

were, in an irregular glistening mass—tales of Io and Zeus, of Keroessa and Poseidon. The organising factor of these myths is, of course, the bull. From an hypostasis of the god to the form of a bull-daughter or ministrant, this animal is at the heart of the series of tales which culminate in the Bull area of Constantinople. They are almost all in the little treatise of Hesychius called *Origines Constantinopoleos*,[1] and that cult motive in them is easily discernible, down to the borders of his own times. There are other sources for these myths, or perhaps, we ought to say, treasuries of their variants. It may seem strange at first that a portion of the Constantine-Silvester literature should be classed among them, though the student of that literature ought to be prepared against the trick of surprise if he has grasped its architectonic possibilities. It seems true to say that the pith of the bull incident in our Convocation legend is to be described as a variant of the tale of Byzantine foundations. Let us see how that could be.

When the older myths about Constantinople are consulted,[2] we can see that their central motive, the Bull, is epitomised in a series of names with family likeness. Those names take us back to the primary meanings of the cult memorialised in the

[1] *Hesychii Opuscula Duo*, ed. Orelli, 1820, 60 ff.

[2] Hesychius, *op. cit.* § 8 ff.; *Etymol. Mag. s.v.* βύζαντες; Stephanus Byz., *s.v.* βυζάντιον; Nonnus, *Dionys.* iii. 366; Polybius, *Hist.* xxi. 21.

myths. There are, for instance, *Keras*, *Keroessa* and *Kreousa*. The Constantinian *Legenda* preserves another in the name *Kraton*. A comparison with the two feminine names formed from *Keras*, and the remembrance that this Latin form is quite like certain cases of *Keras* when it is declined, will give us the natural means by which the *Legenda* form arose. There was, then, a nucleus of *Keras* myth in the lost *Vita Constantini* upon which the lively imagination of the mythographer settled, after it had been stirred by the Old Testament story of Elijah overcoming the priests of Baal. For him Silvester, or Constantine, was the ancient prophet and the Hebrew leaders became the conquered priests. That phase of imaginative stimulus associates itself most properly with the *Anti-Judaica*, based upon excerpts from the Old Testament, which the writer was turning into a Convocation legend wherein the Jews were certain to be beaten in argument. But the occurrence of the Bull incident in the course of that legend demands another phase of stimulus which could come only from a myth concerned with locality. This stimulus must have been present in the source with which the compiler was working; and we can represent it for ourselves in the collocation of *Keras* and *Byzas*. That is to say with the ancient Romulus stories, which were transferred from Old to New Rome, went the ancient Bull stories, which may have originally come from Crete,

and by Thracian travel have become a story of how towns were founded.[1] The name *Kraton* preserves these traditions with an economy of space and line that to-day is called Japanese. There is a brother-judge in the *Legenda*, and it would be damaging to this interpretation if he were obdurate against entering the described circle of myth.

Zenophilus or *Xenophilus* is not a name in any Byzantine myth, and yet he is as much in them all as *Kraton*. While an animal can be made into a man from a portion of its body, what looks to be a portion of the ' bull-region ' of Constantinople can be made into that man's brother. But has literary evidence anything to say upon such a suggestion ? In a Byzantine poem that describes the Church of the Apostles in that city is the line *φόρου τε Ταύρου καὶ μακροῦ Ξηρολόφου*.[2] This is from a poem by Constantine the Rhodian who wrote between the years 931 and 944.[3] He was perhaps a source for Codinus,[4] and is the oldest authority we possess, on such a scale, concerning the archaeology of Constantinople. Socrates[5] has the earliest mention

[1] *e.g.* Hesychius, § 8-9, causes Cretan Amalthea and Thracian Byzia to keep company, and always under the sway of the name Keras ; cp. Nicholas Mesarites (ed. Heisenberg, *Grabeskirche und Apostelkirche*, 1908, ii. 13).

[2] ed. Legrand, *Revue des Études Grecques*, 1886, 37, line 34.

[3] Reinach, *op. cit.* for Legrand, 67.

[4] This suggestion is made in the Legrand-Reinach study on Constantine the Rhodian.

[5] *H.E.* vii. 5 (*P.G.* lxvii. 745 *c*-748 *a*).

of the typographical feature which was made a man, and in a most interesting context. The historian tells how that this ' place ' of the city (Ξηρόλοφος) became the centre of controversies for Jews and Judaisers during the time of Sinsennius. Thus the influence of site in the creation of the Convocation myth is even stronger than as yet we have stated, since there are pre-Christian and Hebrew elements in that constraint—the Bull and the Synagogue factors with their topographical and apologetical correlatives. But how came the name Zenophilus or Xenophilus ? Let us take the lead of a printer's or indexer's error in Du Fresne,[1] where the ' place ' is once rendered as Xenolophus. It is patent surely that where a writer could find *Craton* he would have little difficulty in contriving from such a base as the name of the ' place,' a man's name and call him *Xenophilus* or *Zenophilus*. The cluster of influences we have laid bare is too directly filiated with the structure of the incident of the Bull, and too effectively creative of the discussed names for their presence and products to be denied union. The Socratean strain in the clustered influences which went to the making of the Convocation myth—if thus we may describe the historical motive of Jewish and Christian controversy in the city ' place '—finds its further justification in the fact that the two judges, Craton and Xenophilus, adopt the Christian faith.[2]

[1] *Historia Byzantina*, 1680, 203. [2] *Legenda*, fol. 20 *a*, 1.

The periphery of the context of the name *Xerolophes* in Socrates [1] records the cure of a Jewish paralytic by baptism, since the Jews required a sign—as they do in the Convocation myth—and tells how many of them turned to Christianity when they saw the wonder. Once more it must be acknowledged that it was the pre-Christian factor in the primal *Vita Constantini* which gave the myth its shape when our study of its literary structure is deep enough; the Bull pulled the Synagogue and the Ecclesia in its train.

[1] *H.E.* vii. 4 (745 *b*).

VIII

CONSTANTINE AND ORATORY

It is not surprising to find that Constantine was extolled as an orator and lawgiver. The galaxy of virtues which were claimed for him ought to have included one or two of an intellectual nature. The surprise comes when we trace out the influences that ensured for him oratorical and juridical gifts. This search can be now taken deeper than previous investigations have been able to reach, since that luminous and uncalendared presence we call Discovery has visited us from fields of study adjacent to those which have to do with the history of emperors. That Constantine should have been drawn as an orator makes him no more than some others of the chief figures in Roman or Greek history. The gathering of virtues with these men has never raised any difficulty—it is the manner in which such moral and intellectual jewel-work has come to them that, sometimes, offers a piquant problem to the historian. Constantine is thus a subject of great piquancy. He means so much for contemporary and subsequent history

that it seems as if a kindly watcher had been set to provide that the historian should not say that Constantine was sterile of problems. There are substantial pieces of evidence for both rôles of orator and law-giver. The *Oration* for his eloquence and the Edicts for his legal skill lend body at least to the picture of him dowered with intellectual virtues. Moreover, the edicts are historical documents—and they announce that Constantine has right to be called a maker of laws. The *Oration* has been claimed to be an authentic Constantinian document—and were that so, his claims to the name of orator would have a certain documentary guarantee. Even if its authenticity was made out, the pictorial presentation of the emperor would still demand explanation. Was Claudius or Moses despoiled to robe him? is a question that strikes deeper than clothing. And were the panegyrists or the apologists the limners of that presentation, is a question that has power in its answer to throw fresh light on the rise and progress of the myth of Constantine as orator.

The examination of a moment exhibits that with the assumption of Claudian purpose, Constantine also took unto himself the oratorical afflatus. Time is against the proof of that assumption and so too is its natural possibility. We may acknowledge that if only Trebellius Pollio[1] had written earlier his eulogy of Claudius then the contrary

[1] Claudius, 2, 3 ff.

voice of Time could have been overcome—whatever the argument for the descent of a virtue from an ancestor who was not his had to say. The shadow of Moses has fallen on the pages of Pollio ; and it puts one hand on Claudius and another on Constantine, as his Eulogy shows, in a manner that is not original to him. He has learnt it from sources a little nearer the days of Constantine than his own. For neither genealogical fancy nor Neo-Platonic subtlety had endued the emperor with the intellectual capacities of an orator who was a maker of laws, but the invasion of himself by Mosaic connotations tinged with Claudian colour. We began our study of Constantinian myths with a consideration of the general characteristics of the Eusebian 'mass' and 'line'; we shall have to close this examination with an analysis for the particulars of its genesis, since only in that way can we arrive at the fashion of the Hebraeo-Sabine invasion of the picture of Constantine.

The factors of that picture are, of course, few. These are explicit and frankly show themselves. One is prefatorily Claudian and the two others are Mosaic. This tiny analysis concerns the *Vita*. We find Eusebius, first of all, using his own doctrine of Providence to account for Constantine's coming to the throne.[1] Next, Providence becomes the Eusebian periphrasis for Claudian descent—since both doctrine and imperial ancestor

[1] *Vita*, i. 24.

become merged into the notion of descent by the law of nature.[1] The myth of descent must then have been known to Eusebius. His generosity of mind, or the inherent elasticity of his view of Providence—a quality that most theologians have been content to use to the uttermost—was capable of sheltering the myth. The Mosaic factor expresses itself, first, by making the speech of Constantine come as that of Moses did—that is, by theophanies.[2] If Sinai is not actually brought into Constantinian topography, Eusebius instils the Sinai atmosphere thus early in the *Vita*. Moreover, like a vital context to the Mosaic method, is the presence of the Hebrew leader both before and after its statement.[3] A doctrine of Providence assumes a Roman toga from Claudius' wardrobe; and the personality of a Graeco-Roman emperor becomes imbued with that of a Hebrew prophet.[4] It has been said that the vital context to the method comes after, as well as before, the statement of how the thing was done. This becomes true when, as indeed should be done, the Mosaic

[1] *Vita*, i. 21 and 50; *H.E.* x. 8, 4.

[2] *Vita*, i. 47. [3] *Vita*, i. 12, 20, 38.

[4] There is another factor in the Eusebian portrait of Constantine; this may perhaps be called the Philonic. Cp. Heinisch, *Der Einfluss Philos auf die Alteste Christliche Exegese*, 1908, 211 ff. where he deals particularly with Clement of Alexandria. The *Vita Const.* of Eusebius ought to be examined for Philonic influence through the *Vita Moysis*. On this matter see Benjamin, Pauly-Wissowa, 1423.

references in the *Historia* are added to those of the *Vita*. Therein [1] Moses is plainly made to be the spiritual ancestor of Constantine.[2] The literary stimuli, which sketched in Constantine as Moses in the *Vita*, lined in the figure in the *Historia*. Later that firm drawing is bitten in as with an etcher's acid, though not by the hand of Eusebius. It is this picture of Constantine which has passed into the mind of the Western world.

Now somewhere between the writing of the *Historia* in Greek and its translation into Latin by Rufinus,[3] there were documents in existence which brought together the picture of Constantine as another Moses and the vision he is said to have had before he fought with Maxentius at the bridge, in such vital relations as to demonstrate the common source for the two outstanding features of the etched-in figure of the emperor that the world knows. The establishment of this source for the dual characteristics—the later Moses [4] whose rod is the *Labarum*—relieves Eusebius from the charge of doing what an unknown authority, or authorities, did in creating the

[1] *H.E.* ix. 9, 1 *a*.

[2] See *supra*, c. i., etc.

[3] *H.E.* ix. 9 (ed. Mommsen, 829). The Vision has no such relations as the *H.E.* exhibits, cp. *Vita*, i. 28 f.

[4] Becker has written an interesting study on Constantine as the 'neue Moses' (*Zeit. für Kirchengeschichte*, 1910, 161 ff.), based on a study of sarcophagi whose reliefs he attributes to a Constantinian renaissance and whose subjects are drawn from the Moses story.

Claudian genealogy of Constantine. Eusebius is thus not guilty of fitting a Mosaic myth to the emperor's story. He lifts what facts he knows about Constantine [1] into the transforming light of the most ancient Christology with its accompanying literary constituents from which it was created. Both the sort of man Constantine is depicted as being and the 'sign' he bears are originally due to that service. What and whence is this fresh and influential source?

The narrative of the vision which Constantine is said to have seen on the eve of his battle with Maxentius is the capital document for the understanding of the ecclesiastical Constantine and the *Labarum*. There are three chief versions of it: 1. The Eusebian; 2. The Lactantian; 3. The Neo-Lactantian. These versions record the genesis and growth of the ecclesiastical figure of Constantine and his sign. Their process for the first two stages is a purely literary one. Eusebius and Lactantius utilise the same literary source, though in the instance of the philosopher that source is

[1] The question as to the authenticity of the documents used by Eusebius in the *Vita* must be considered as still unsolved. Seeck's latest views (*Geschichte*, 1897, etc.; *Zeit. f. Kirchengeschichte*, 1898, 321 ff., 1909, 183) that all are authentic are inexact. The more measured views of Schultze (*Z. f. K.* 1894, 503 ff.) may even have to be revised and the number of authentic documents lessened. For more radical opinions concerning them, see Benjamin in Pauly-Wissowa *sub Constantin*; or Peter, *Die geschichtliche Litteratur über die römische Kaiserzeit*, 1897, i. 405 ff. etc.

of an extended and Syrian type.[1] In the Neo-Lactantian stage the version is based on the same ancient source, but its characteristics are due to the author's harmonisation of it with recent military events in the life of Constantine. Of the first two versions one has its personal allusion; but the event in Eusebius—despite the detail of his narrative—is subordinate to the literary source which commanded: 'Get your man born quick,'[2] and thus decreed his plan and shape. In Lactantius there is no intrusion of the event or person, he only yields us the source for the creation of the emperor and symbol. These three versions are most significant since one was written by Constantine's chief biographer, a second by a scholar who taught at his court and a third by a writer who knew contemporary history so well that it moulds the vision to its own curves.

The details of Eusebius' account of the vision are so familiar that we shall mention only a few of its main features.[3] Constantine is said to have seen a cross of light in the noon-day sky: its motto was: τούτῳ νίκα; after seeing this vision the emperor sent for priests to explain what these things meant, and they interpreted them in terms

[1] *e.g.* Burch, *op. cit.* 128 ff.

[2] I borrow the phrase from that fascinating writer Paget: *I have reason to believe*, 1921, 20; but I have intruded an accent foreign to his.

[3] *Vita*, i. 27 ff.

of Christology. Some details of the conflict with Maxentius intervene between the vision and the proclamation of Constantine as the later Moses.[1] Now when we enquire about the particulars of the cross seen by Constantine, Eusebius tells us that it was in the form of the chi-rho symbol for the name of Christ.[2] Eusebius records an advance upon an older tradition. For instance, Barnabas [3] wrote that the *iota*, the *eta* and the *tau* revealed Jesus and His cross. He too was refashioning a tradition prior to himself, and he always made simple things into complex things. It was the way of his quaintly reverberant sort of mind. The earliest tradition is preserved in more than one extant text of the first century writing that underlies the *Epistle* of Barnabas.[4] We will choose the Cyprianic text of this anti-Judaic work. Its descriptive designation should be kept in mind. Its literary nature, in a word or two, is this: the book is made up of a heterogeneous series of excerpts from the Hebrew Scriptures together with some short pieces from the Sapiential writings; and these disconnected extracts are made one in an alphabetic attempt to explain who and what Jesus

[1] *Vita*, i. 38 f.

[2] *Vita*, i. 31. No such matter is in the *Historia* nor anything about Constantine's conversion.

[3] *Ep.* ix. 8.

[4] *e.g.* Harris and Burch, *op. cit.* i. 33 ff.; Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 1920, 409 ff.

Christ was.[1] This alphabet of Christology, for it is so simple in its mental movements that no other description seems to fit it, starts from the idea of explaining Him by means of the name *Sophia*. The notion of this work was to meet the small grasp, first of all, of the Palestinian mind. Jesus Christ was born among such simple people that the sure progress of His revelation could be made only as they understood it in their own mental dialect.[2] In the Cyprianic text,[3] certain excerpts have to do with the cross of Christ. The chief of them is Exodus, xvii. 9 ff., which tells how Moses went to the hillside with the 'uirga Dei'[4] in his hand, and how thence by stretching out his arms crosswise he controlled the battle against Amalek, so that the 'sign' conquered. It does not require a sensitive eye to see herein the mental material of the alleged Constantinian vision. We can be certain also that we are not now dealing with a mere literary *rapprochement* between Cyprian and Eusebius—or even between the bishop and a Cyprianic writing from an original Greek text—for this Mosaic incident was inwoven

[1] Harris and Burch, *op. cit.* ii. 58 ff. etc.

[2] Burch, *op. cit.* 11 ff.

[3] *Testimonia adversus Judaeos*, ii. 20 ff.

[4] This is the source of those variants known in Byzantium such as 'the rod of Moses' or 'the rod of the Theotokos' (Constantine vii, *De Cerim.* i. 40; *P.G.* cxii. 1188*a*). Becker tries wrongly to base these variants on a misunderstanding of the Septuagint, 1 *K* viii. 9, ii. *Chron.* v. 10.

by Paul into a most popular passage in his Letter to the Philippians,[1] and with the same anti-Judaic outlook of the book that has been given Cyprian's name. Let us return to the analysis of the vision.

Its essential material is in this Mosaic passage that occurs in the earliest Christological document. And the motto borne by the visionary cross is as well the creation of those two agents. It does not spring from the text of Exodus xvii. Thence it can be educed only as a resultant of the battle. When, however, the Cyprianic book is examined again, we find at the point of our use of it that there is an intercalated line of ancient prose[2] between the Exodus excerpt and that which precedes it. The line runs thus: 'Hoc signo crucis et Amalech uictus est ab Iesu per Moysen.' The longer renderings of the motto could be said to come verbally from that source. For when we turn to the Rufinus version of Eusebius' *Historia* (ix. 3), we find him interpolating the Greek text with an account of the vision in a Mosaic context. The motto has this rendering, 'τούτῳ νίκα: quod est, in hoc vince . . . signum crucis.' The omitted

[1] The metaphors from flat-racing, which have long been forced on *Phil.* iii. 13, do not fit either the language or ideas of Paul. That Paul knew and used the ancient anti-Judaic Christological mode I have shown in my book.

[2] These prose remains are few and fragmentary. On no reasonable ground can they be attributed to Cyprian.

phrase has no significance,[1] that would influence either way this suggestion of the verbal source for the motto as it is found in the interpolation of Rufinus. We shall find good reason for believing that Rufinus did not go to the *Vita Constantini* by Eusebius, and from it compose the passage which he has introduced into his translation of the *Historia*. The groundwork of the vision is the same in both writers, for their sources are the same. The description of the vision is in all particulars, save one, identical; and it is Constantinopolitan and later than Lactantius. These two last points demand attention.

The backbone of the philosopher's apology is the ancient Christological document. He uses the Amalek excerpt [2] in exactly the same manner as Barnabas or Justin or Irenaeus—or more importantly than these, as Paul. Thus we know that this very old piece of Christological exegesis has found its way to the court of Constantine. We can be doubly certain of this fact by recalling the parallel in the *De Mortibus persecutorum*,[3] where the vision is closely woven with the incidents of

[1] Rufinus, ix. 3: 'tum vero laetus redditus et de victoria jam securus.' For earlier references, between Rufinus and S. Paul, see Justin; *Trypho*, 91, 112, 131; Irenaeus, *Apos. Preaching*, 46, and Barnabas, *Ep.* xii. 2. Another early reference is in the *Odes of Solomon*, XXVII. i.; cp. the Mosaic gloss in the Nitrian MS. reading of this verse (Harris and Mingana, 1920, 357).

[2] Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* iv. 17, 12.

[3] 44, 5-6 (ed. Brandt, *Lactanti Opera*, II. ii. 223).

the campaign against Maxentius. The author of this work drops the Mosaism of the exegesis which made the vision, and he interprets the symbol in military values. These are clearly from the exploits of Constantine. He writes as one who had contemporary knowledge of them,[1] and interprets as one who wrote after the events and under their spell. The interpolation of Rufinus has also this military valuation, with its summary in the description 'labarum.' The writing attributed to Lactantius has a sword-wise design[2] and interpretation of it as the monogram of Christ, whilst Rufinus has only that kind of interpretation. Thus before the year 403,[3] when Rufinus undertook the translation of the *Historia,* a wholly militarised version of the vision was known in Constantinople. It is not improbable that its creation was due to the author of *De mortibus persecutorum.*[4] The differences between the Lactantian version and his offer fresh and potent reasons why this writing cannot be said to be by

[1] Cp. Lawlor, *Eusebiana*, 1912, 240 ff.

[2] *De mort. persec.* 44, 5, 'signum dei notaret in scutis.'

[3] Bardenhewer, *Geschichte altchrist. Lit.* 1912, iii. 554.

[4] I write thus because it is not possible to accept the Lactantian authorship of this work. Fresh findings are coming to fortify the chief positions taken up by Brandt, *Sitzungsberichte der Phil.-Hist. Classe Akad. der Wiss. Wien*, 1892, vi. Abh. 22 ff. For summary of critical work up to the time of writing, see Bury, ed. Gibbon, ii. 531; or Coleman, *op. cit.* 79, 2, who seems to declare over confidently for the authorship of Lactantius.

the philosopher.[1] Even Eusebius, in the *Vita*, has advanced beyond Lactantius—though both of them use the same old Christological authority. This in itself is a sufficient foundation for the opinion that Eusebius embodies in the *Vita* a Constantinopolitan version of the vision which arose after the time of Lactantius, and before the author of *De mortibus persecutorum*. For the version of Eusebius is but partially militarised, whilst its roots are certainly in the soil of Constantinople. Thus we must rearrange the order of the three versions of the vision : 1. The Lactantian, because it is only from the ancient Christological document and has no temporal incidents like the battles of Constantine ; 2. The Eusebian, which is a parti-version of the Constantinople usage of the vision and its Mosaic basis subject to the conquest of Maxentius ; 3. The Neo-Lactantian, which is either a re-editing of certain matter gathered by Lactantius concerning the doings of Constantine unto which was added religious commentary somewhat after the style of the philosopher ; or a writing by an imitator of Lactantius who was contemporary with the events in Constantine's life[2] which occupy a large place in his

[1] Another fresh reason is in his imitative uses of *testimonia*. On this see *infra*, p. 206. See the Appendix to chap. iv. in my book for the latest criticism of Pichon's views concerning the sources, etc., of *Testimonia* used in the writings of Lactantius.

[2] He could make mistakes in these as his reference to Nicomedian affairs shows (*De mort. persec.* 48). In previous chapters

book. A Neo-Lactantian achievement, such as the *De Mortibus* represents, is a piece of literature which harmonises well with the movement which began with the building of the Claudian myth, and closed with the creation of that picture of the emperor as Claudius-cum-Moses, who was obedient to a heavenly vision and voice composed from the oldest anti-Judaic work in Christendom. The famous sign and its motto were fashioned from the same material. That the sign became Christian is a matter of history, but that Constantine used that sign against Maxentius is not now a matter of history. A Constantinople version of this vision born of a study-lamp took its place in the Eusebian *Vita*, because it joined again with the bishop's knowledge of its source, and fused naturally with the bodying-forth of the true imperial figure in Eusebius' mind from the same ancient source. The Neo-Lactantian achievement is equalled only by the Silvester literature for its power to impose

10-20, he is exact concerning Nicomedia—with perhaps an exception in the fanciful conversation between Diocletian and Galerius (18). The false Edict (44) is not the sort of document to be expected from the pen of Lactantius. Pichon, *Lactance*, 1901, 355 ff., has to adopt a peripatetic hypothesis to make out a possible case for Lactantian authorship. This is conjecture; the false edict is in the book. Pichon (p. 360) in reality yields up his case when he lends himself to the argument that however the book is looked at ' l'œuvre exprime à la fois les sentiments personnels de Lactance.' As to the Edict, we can be reasonably sure that Lactantius never became a species of panegyrist for Constantine.

myth on the Western mind. For the first pervaded that writer who is most worthy of respect among the earlier ecclesiastical historians, and the second created a series of documents which could substantiate the most imaginative deductions made from him by ecclesiastical apologists. The Eusebian 'mass' and 'line' are facts of literary architecture. Not Cyrus but Moses in a Christological context is the spiritual substance of the emperor Eusebius conceives Constantine to be. Constantinople awakened that mental stuff to take the shape of the emperor: the documents sent thence became its moulding influences. Eusebius is not to be blamed as a writer of false history. Modern students of the *Vita* swing, through a century of study, from one extreme to the other concerning his trustworthiness. Mauso[1] in 1817 swings to the extreme left, and Seeck in 1911 to the extreme right; whilst about midway in that period Crivellucci,[2] for instance, is more radical than the critics at the beginning of the century. The historian cannot rise above his sources. That Eusebius used them, is openly claimed in his writings. Where these came with lively faculties of attachment to the things he knew, and which were their literary sources—there the historian

[1] *Leben Constantins des Grossen nebst einigen Abhandlungen geschicht-Inhalts*, 1817, 263 ff.

[2] *Storia delle Relazioni tra lo Stato e la Chiesa*, 1886, i. 135 ff.

obeyed the imperious psychological demand to render the subject of the *Vita* in the terms of that source. The sympathetic bishop threw about the emperor the beauty of the spiritual robes he had woven from the ancient primer of Christology. Therefore, in almost all of its details, the judgement on Eusebius of a revered scholar, as Duchesne was and is, is fundamentally wrong. He says that enthusiasm for Constantine shaped the *Vita*. It served as well to hide the murder of Crispus and to expose Nicaea without a word about Arius. 'It is,' he says, 'a triumph of reticence, and of circumlocution.' The words are many for the evidence was small; but the charge of omissions should be laid at the door of Constantinople, which gave Eusebius the slender equipment of such evidence. Duchesne proceeds to consider Constantine as a Christian believer. He calls him 'un chrétien convaincu,' who in 327 was not yet baptised.[1] The emperor is said to believe in 'une théologie sommaire'—in a supreme being, a sort of Romano-Greek Caesar in the heavenly regions rather than in the complications of a Logos Christology. His monotheism was 'essentially religious, and religious in the Christian sense, a monotheism revealed and manifested in Jesus Christ, a saving monotheism which the Church conserves and pro-

[1] Duchesne, *Histoire Ancienne de l'Église*, 1908, ii. 74 f. and 90. We have come upon Batiffol's authority for his description of Constantine's spiritual conditions.

pagates by her teaching and discipline and cult.' Where Constantinople has been forgotten, the Vatican has been remembered, since there can be no doubt that the eminent theologian's summary of Constantine's opinions is a fluent nodal creation that gathers width as it goes on. It begins with a small node that seems to come from Constantine's mind—that emperor on the circle of the earth—it ends in the wide anachronism of the Roman official theology. Just as the overlooking of Constantinople as the supplier of evidence prevents a correct estimate of Eusebius' part in the portraiture in the *Vita*; so also the invasion of the Vatican prevents the realisation of how that evidence was lifted into the fashioning powers of the bishop's own beliefs, and that quite naturally—from its source—the Moses of the rod who overcame Amalek by the crosswise attitude became the Constantine-cum-Moses of the *Labarum* who overthrew Maxentius by the vision of the Cross of Christ. The Christological movement of thought, from the *Sophia* interpretation of Christ as it was in the ancient source, to the Logos rendering of that view as it was in the mind of Eusebius, is that which made the *Vita* and its Constantine. An anti-Judaic Moses gave him an imperial Christian self and sign;[1] and a slight progression in thought,

[1] This new factor for the discussion of the rise and values of the Constantinian sign reopens the whole problem. At the present, there are three theories concerning its first and popular

from the concept of Christ in the document whence this Moses comes to that believed in by Eusebius, gave him an imperial Christian mind. We must now find out whether the historic relations of these high matters and Constantine were more than a projection of Eusebius into him. The *Oration* alleged to have been addressed to the Nicene Council is clearly our first means of knowledge. Is the *Oration* as well as the orator a creation in which the real Constantine plays little or no part? If ancient *Anti-Judaica* can make a special kind of orator, can it not also make an oration?

form: 1. Helios origin, and traceable back to Graeco-Bactrian origin of the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C., see Rapp, *Jahrbuch des Vereins von Altertumsfreunden in Rheinlände*, 1866, 66 ff. 2. Double-axe cult origin, and traceable in part back to Neolithic times; see Conybeare, *Roman Britain*, 1911, 282, 2; Cook, *Transactions of the Third Internat. Congress of Religions*, 1908, ii. 192 ff; Schremmer, *Labarum und Steinaxt*, 1911. 3. Christian origin, all apologetical literature. 1 and 2 have yet to yield a final conclusion, 3 looks to be settled by our discovery of the means of the Christianisation of the sign said to have been seen by the emperor. This interpretation of a symbol adopted by him is at least *prima facie* evidence that his usage was pagan. The syncretisms of helmet and coins also look in that direction. A fresh suggestion may be offered concerning the origin of a variant of the better known form of the symbol. The *rho* mark, through this *chi*, is in the second sort a straight short line with a globular head—*e.g.* Maurice, *op. cit.* i. 323 f. This second sign appears after Constantine had overthrown Licinius. That victory took place in Paionia. There the most ancient cult-form of Helios was a disc on an upright—Sboronos, *L'Hellenisme primitif de la Macedoine*, 1919, 17 ff.; see also Cook, *Folk-Lore*, 1904, 410. 221; *Zeus*, 1914, i. 291. For its Boeotian

Until we have the documents right, we cannot determine the place of Constantine in relation to the Nicene Council. The event has so large a place in ecclesiastical history that the suspicion of an episcopal signature to any in the body of conciliar documents, or its lack, determines the theological colour of a geographical area. How much more then would the remote or near relationships of Constantine stamp him and the process of Church history that is said to have its rise in him, with accent and system of thought which are Nicaean. The bare possibility of that com-

analogue, Proclus, *Christomathia*, 25 (Gaisford, 352 ff.). The early Christian inscription, De Rossi, *Inscrip. Christianae*, i. No. 10, has not the same sign as this variant of the Constantinian symbol. Early writers were eager to make this symbol Christian—*e.g.* Leo Grammaticus, *Chron.* 85 (ed. Bekker, 1842), unites with it the features said to have been seen in the vision before Constantine fought with Maxentius. Theodosius Melit. *Chron.* 61 (ed. Tafel, 1869), follows Leo. For other references to Paionia and Constantine see Joannes Malalas, *Chron.* xiii. (*P.G.* xcvii. 473 f.); Zonaras, *Annal.* xiii. (*P.G.* cxxxiv. 1097 f.); Theophanes, *Chron.* i. 19 (ed. Classen, 1839); George Hamartolus, *Chron.* 38 (ed. Muralt, 1859); Julius Pollux, *Historica Physica*, 256 (ed. Hardt, 1792). It was after the overcoming of Licinius that events like Constantine's baptism and the founding of *Sophia* occurred. If thus late in his reign Constantine did adopt a variant on his first sign, and that from an ancient Paionian cult object, then it can be argued afresh that the first form of the sign was also an appropriated cult object or sign. History does not permit us to believe in a progressive declension from the Christian religion such as is involved in the statement that Constantine was rebaptised towards the end of his life.

merce is, and has been, enough to hypnotize writers on his period into the creation of an emperor who is an ideal president of the Council or rather the depository of all the developments of official expressions of faith in the West.[1] Another phase of its importance underlies the claim of Ferrero,[2] that 'Constantine, in seeking to reconstitute the unity of the Empire by the aid of Christianity, introduced a new disintegrating force, namely, theological disputes.' The Italian historian evidently makes an antithesis between a theological Constantine and Arius, between Nicaea and Nicomedia. A suspect Constantinian document is an insufficient basis for such an opinion. He too has overlooked to explain the faith of Constantine from the sort of churches he built. His conclusion, therefore, can only be ascribed to the same inhibitory influences—an understandable psychological factor when the great importance of the Nicene Council is taken into full consideration. Thus the *Oratio* is a document of the highest import for the determination either of the mind of Constantine or of an early attempt to give him a mind suitable to his position as the convener of the Council.

[1] *e.g.* Jansen, *Konstantin de Groote*, 1920, 55 ff. Duchesne's picture is of this sort. Such views are later expressions of the eighteenth century Rostock simplicity.

[2] *The Ruin of the Ancient Civilization and the Triumph of Christianity*, 1921, 157 ff.

All sense of proportion would be lost if we were to embark on a complete examination of the *Oratio*. Indeed, the duty of undertaking such a piece of work has been carried out by two orders of critics in such a thorough manner as to bring, it would appear, the arguments for and against its authenticity to a condition of balance. For the Constantinian authorship we may cite Wendland,[1] Schwartz,[2] and Pfättisch;[3] and against, Rossignol,[4] Mancini,[5] and Heikel.[6] This theoretical balance has been brought down on the 'for' side by the recent sixteen-hundredth celebrations in behalf of Constantine. Not that fresh evidence has been demonstrated for the traditional positions regarding the emperor, but that something like a reactive affirmation has been made for these by grandiose ceremonies which would appear to lose much of their significance if they were emptied of these connotations. The delicate results of textual criticism seem to have less weight than thistledown against that of the institution which en-

[1] *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1902, 225 ff.

[2] *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1908, 3097 ff.

[3] *Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen auf ihre Echtheit untersucht*, 1908; *Das Eusebius Pamphili*, xvi. ff. (*Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, 1913, Bd. 1); in Dölger, *op. cit.* 96 ff.

[4] *Virgile et Constantin le Grand*, 1845.

[5] *Studi Storici*, 1894, 92 ff. and 207 ff.; cp. Harnack, *Alt-Christlich. Lit.* ii. 2, 117.

[6] Ed. *Oratio*, xci. ff. (*Eusebius Werke*, 1902, Bd. i.).

thrones Constantine in its most ancient and storied basilica. If the balance is to be redressed or the 'against' side is to go down, fresh evidence alone can accomplish that. Nothing less than that ought to be used for the criticism of views which have been long held.

This impression of balance in opinion concerning the *Oratio* comes from several broad findings which can be valued, for solid reasons, as being for and against the Constantinian authorship. For instance, the argument for its dependence on the apology of Lactantius is an assured result of the critical study of the *Oratio*. There are excellent reasons why this result should be said to face both ways. The proof that there was not only borrowing of cited material, but that also the *Oratio* shows many signs of close textual modelling on the work of Lactantius [1]—is an argument against the emperor's authorship. It serves as well, by a gentle pressure back of such findings, to demonstrate that a work with so much Lactantian material in it would have been prepared for Constantine—since the philosopher was a member of his retinue. Again, the broad conclusion that the *Oratio* represents a translation from Latin into Greek [2] looks in the direction of Constantinian work, if temporal conclusions to be derived from the study

[1] *e.g.* Mancini, *op. cit.* 212 ff.; Heikel, *op. cit.* xciv. ff.

[2] Besides the critics already referred to, see Krüger, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1909, 56; Löscheke, *Berliner Philol. Wochenschrift*, 1910, 358.

of the text bring its material within the emperor's reign. This argument becomes a contrary one when the temporal considerations are not to be limited to that period; or if it is demonstrated that the sections which were likely to have been first in Latin [1] are few as against those which must first have been in Greek—a contrary conclusion that loses a little of its edge when the critic is asked to make allowance for the Greek dress which the *Oratio* is said to have assumed after it had been delivered. From such conclusions there are two lines of deduction that could lead to a clear decision. These have to do with date and source. The temporal point explains itself, whilst that of the source demands comment. The Lactantius material found in the *Oratio* consists for the most part, if not wholly, of citations from Sibylline literature used in his manner. He drew them from a peculiar source. The question, therefore, to be answered is whether the composer of the *Oratio* knew that source in an edition unknown to Lactantius, since it is manifest that its author either added to the sort of literary material that Lactantius used with a singular and refined sense of choice—a rather remarkable achievement if that was so—or that he drew upon a more extensive version of what was source for both Lactantius and himself.

[1] *e.g. Oratio*, xviii.-xx. as against the rest of the work which where it is not Plato is the Septuagint.

The Sibylline material used by Lactantius is of two sorts—that which is known by the technical name of the Sibylline Oracles and that which he knew as the Cumaean or Erythraean Sibyls.[1] The first sort represents the copious collection of oracular material, of pre- and post-Christian date, which has influenced so many minds to make an insistent eschatological emphasis, whilst the second sort represents the smaller collection of the Klarian oracles of Apollo. Lactantius was a scholar; therefore, his range of reference should be large. Two sorts of literature, with a common descriptive in the term 'Sibyllines' would naturally evoke one another in his memory. Thus Pichon,[2] for instance, appears to have argued as he analyses the Graeco-Roman in Lactantius who could find a more sympathetic intellectual area of knowledge in the Apolline sayings or in the Sibylline Oracles; since it is said concerning the latter that they held a larger place in the mind of Lactantius than the Old or New Testaments. Classical by instinct and learning, Lactantius would understand them better with their Greek form analogous to that of the hymns of Cleanthes.[3] According to Pichon, the ideas in the Oracles are more clear, the terms more philosophical and the imagery more chaste than those of Hebrew

[1] *Div. Inst.* i. 6, 10 ff. [2] *Lactance*, 207 ff.

[3] Cf. Rzach, *Oracula Sibyllina*, 1891, 240 ff., where he tabulates *Memoriae Homericae et Hesiodeae*, etc.

prophet or psalmist, because the Oracles are strongly Hellenised. These features would recommend them to the taste of Lactantius; therefore, his use of them is also a proof of his personal scholarship. This characterisation of the apologist, when viewed as a general picture of Lactantius' mental qualities, has accuracy; but it cannot be considered so when details are looked into, such as whether the writer had immediate knowledge of the Sibylline Oracles, or did he know them through their inclusion in another source which placed certain portions from that literature side by side with certain portions from Hebrew prophecies and psalms. The French critic would be an impressionist rather than a miniaturist, if those questions were answered by demonstrating an inclusive literary source with a distinctive reason for its choice of material. And the text of Lactantius' book asks for the more detailed and delicate treatment.[1]

From the fourth book, where the apologist reaches the height of his argument, we may choose chapters twelve and thirteen. They are in the succession of his proof of the historicity and

[1] Our choice of sections for examination is, of course, determined by parallels between the *Div. Inst.* and the *Oratio*—but only so as to delimit a portion that is representative and practical enough for our purpose and not to make an arbitrary and fortuitous selection. The document that is drawn upon in the selected sections of *Div. Inst.* is that which is the Christological basis of the whole book, see *supra* 193 and Harris and Burch, *op. cit.* i. 76 ff. etc.

divinity of Jesus Christ. If we remove the slight body in the shape of Lactantius' own comments—and they are rarely more than a sentence or two in length,—we expose the bone structure of his argument in the shape of *testimonia* from a variety of sources. It is instructive to view them as they occur in the twelfth chapter that we may see their lack of relation with one another and their variety. Thus, Lactantius cites Odes of Solomon, xix. 6; Isaiah, vii. 17; Ps. lxxxiv. 12; Is. lxiii. 10 f.; Is. xlv. 8; Is. ix. 6; Dan. vii. 13 f.; Ps. cix. 1; Is. xlv. 1 f.—a strangely assorted grouping of passages with one unusual source. When we pass on to the thirteenth chapter the grouping is as strange and more unusual, since Apolline prophecy follows Moses and Sibylline prophecy comes after Hebrew psalmist and prophet.[1] These excerpts look like the spilt wealth of a fine memory or the enlightenedly perverse threading of tiny literal things of the homilist. Their disparate character is most plain. They do not prove, however, that Lactantius' memory was rich and almost uncontrolled, or that he was an ancestor of those religious writers who, in the service of piety or dogma, have made nonsense of the literary sources of their religion. Nor do they mean what Brandt's foot-

[1] Is. xlv. 14 f.; Baruch, iii. 36 f.; Ps. xlvii. 7 f.; Jer. xvii. 9; Is. xix. 20; Num. xxiv. 17; Apolline Oracle (cp. Wolff, *Porphyrii De Philosophia Ex Oraculis Haurienda*, 1866, 185); Ps. xxvii. 4 f.; Is. xi. 10; Is. xi. 1 f.; ii. Sam. vii. 4 ff.; Sibylline Oracle as in Sedulius, 245, see *infra*, p. 217; Ps. cxxvi. 1.

notes to his edition of Lactantius, for instance, would lead a reader to infer—namely, that for the great part the biblical citations were borrowed from Cyprian. The African bishop evinces no knowledge of the *Odes* or of oracular literature, Apolline and Judaeo-Christian. Then the connexion between Cyprian and Lactantius is more fundamental than the latter's knowledge of a book by the former writer. These two early Christian representatives know the same book—Cyprian in a shorter and African version,[1] Lactantius in a longer and Syrian version. The third century is dependent on the first century, and the two third century writers on different versions of the first century 'book.' An ancient mode of Christological argument is ruling both African ecclesiastic and Nicomedian philosopher, and not the waywardness of a communicated passion for quotations.

This first century document was of the nature of an elementary primer of Christology. It spelled out, for simple men and women, the meanings of Jesus Christ, who and what He was, in a language they could natively grasp. Its mode was inspired by Christ: its material was gathered and shaped from before the time of the writing of the earliest book in the New Testament until a little after the

[1] With the discovery of the *Testimonia* document older views on this Cyprianic work are valuable only as they discuss its biblical text; *e.g.* Haussleiter, *Commentationes Woelfflinianae*, 1891, 377 ff.; Monceaux, *Histoire Littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, 1902, ii. 277 ff.

death of Constantine the Great.[1] The mode was a teaching mode. For the revelation of Christ was meant to pass out of the bounds of Palestine into the greater world. It is clear that a new order of teaching could make such progress only as it was understood. Therefore, as the Gospels show, Jesus chose small excerpts from Hebrew writings—both canonical and apocryphal as the later biblical classification would describe them—which took upon them the charm of parable or the jewel-work of sayings, or became the source of interpretative names for Christ. These are the beginnings of the 'document.' After Him it is seen in use throughout the writings of the New Testament. Paul draws upon it and not upon the Hebrew or Greek Old Testament. The uniformity of the message, on the lips of the first Christian missionaries, is traceable to the influence of this 'document.' Thus, another source is added to our knowledge for that most early and remarkable Church History, the Acts of the Apostles.[2] In these and in many other ways this 'document' so interpenetrates the text of the New

[1] I include in this statement only the more remarkable versions of the ancient document. There were others. Isidore of Seville, for instance, knows an institutionalised version. On this and other versions, see my book.

[2] Reference must again be made to the authorities cited several times; the books written in collaboration with my former colleague, Dr. Rendel Harris, and my own book. For these discoveries are very recent. Their reception at the hands of a

Testament that unless we understand it, we cannot follow how and with what values the revelation of Jesus Christ captured the minds of men and women in the first centuries. So also we are unable to understand *au fond*, for instance, that Cyprian and Lactantius are using the same primitive Christian document—the former knowing it, but striving to hide his knowledge by turning it to pious usage or by deliberate fracture of its text, and the latter knowing it and manifesting his knowledge with his engaging frankness.

Therefore, when we examine the two selected chapters from the *Institutiones*, we may be sure that they do not merely exhibit the writer's knowledge of Cyprian and some evidence of his own power of citation; but that Lactantius is building his apologetic argument on the primitive Christological document in a version that has local characteristics. His quotation of the *Odes of Solomon* with its proper *Testimonia* phrase of preface,[1] is sufficient to mark his version as having arisen in Syria.[2] Another note of the same kind is in the text's inclusion of the Sibylline Oracles—a note that is shared by other early Syrian apologists who knew the *Testimonia* document, Justin Martyr,[3] and

number of prominent Continental and English scholars gives confidence to make this repetition. For fresh light on Cyprian see the last chapter of my book.

[1] Harris and Burch, *op. cit.* i. 21 ff. etc.

[2] Cp. Harris and Mingana, *op. cit.* ii. 9.

[3] *e.g. Apol.* i. 20 and 44 f.

Theophilus of Antioch.[1] The startling feature of this version is, however, its auxiliary use of certain Apolline Oracles. Now this text which incorporates matter from the Sibyllines is of importance for the critical study of the *Oratio,* whilst its annexed Apolline matter has the same value for the critical study of the *Vita* of the imperial orator. We will thus treat in turn the two orders of oracular material in Lactantius' *Testimonia* text; for that is the demand raised by the literary conditions of the *Oratio* at its most significant points of contact with the *Institutiones.*[2]

These points occur in the last third of the *Oratio,* for therein Virgil casts off the toga for the robe of a prophet, and the Sibyllines yield acrostics which are new prophecies from the old by putting some of the lines into novel orders. Lactantius does not know that Virgil made a spiritual pilgrimage to Palestine; and his *Testimonia* text is innocent of acrostics, no matter what verbal or moral beauty they might imply. What he did know was the Sibylline matter, which had been made into acrostics, in its first usage. It will be recalled that the second usage as we have it in the *Oratio*[3] renders the following series of names: ΙΗΣΟΥΣ

[1] *Ad Autolycum,* ii. 31 ff.

[2] *e.g.* Mancini, *op. cit.* 211 ff.; Heikel, *op. cit.* xciv. f. for a list of these parallels.

[3] xviii. ed. Heikel, 179 f. = *Oracula Sibyllina,* viii. 217-243. On this Sibylline document, see, for example, Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina,* 1902, 42 f.

ΧΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ. What is found in Lactantius is a line here and there from that composition—or rather certain of its lines in their first usage. The first P line is used in its earliest eschatological sense,[1] so also is the sixth Σ line (the beginning of the name *Soter*),[2] and the second T and H lines[3] (which come in the same name) are referred to the God and king who will preside at the last Judgement. There, the apologist is citing in its original sense a text of the Sibyllines as it is found in his *Testimonia* text, and from its eschatological sections.[4] The impulse to compose a mosaic from the Sibyllines, which should render the series of names we have quoted, came from the use of such pieces from the original oracles in the Syrian version of the primitive primer of Christology, known as *Testimonia*. A document that interpreted His person furnished the impulse to fit together an acrostic, from one of its sources, to express the names of Christ. The Lactantian tradition in Christological literature had inspired a student of his writings, or an inheritor of his tradition, to a literary effort which, in its small but most interesting manner, did what its model had

[1] *Div. Inst.* vii. 19. 9 = *Oratio*, xviii. line 26, p. 179 = *Or. Sib.* viii. 224.

[2] *Div. Inst.* vii. 16. 11 = *Oratio*, xviii. line 13, p. 180 = *Or. Sib.* viii, 239.

[3] *Div. Inst.* vii. 20. 3 = *Oratio*, xviii. lines 15-16, p. 180 = *Or. Sib.* viii. 241 f.

[4] Cp. *e.g.* the Cyprianic *Testimonia*, ii. 28 ff.

done—it turned prophetic material from one sort into another, from forecasting a Hebrew deliverer into foreshadowing the Christ. It is necessary then to make out the principal implication of our findings, that this literary work was done after the time of Lactantius ; since its proof will settle the question whether the *Oratio* can be ascribed to Constantine—or in other words, it will enlighten us concerning the myth of the emperor as orator.

This little literary effort would seem to have been predestined to be set round about with fascination, for not only is it connected with the name of Constantine the Great, but it also was known to Augustine, and twenty-seven of its lines are quoted in his *De Civitate Dei*.[1] To place it there was as if it had been spoken at the entrance to the nave of the mediaeval Church. The bishop of Hippo cites his lines in Latin, whilst the author of the *Oratio* has them in Greek. Augustine annotates them in a careful way to show, for instance, why where the Greek lines commence with *upsilon*, the Latin fails to maintain the acrostic. More than this, he informs us that he had just read ' this Erythraean Sibyl ' concerning Christ, in Latin : and that the verses were in bad unrhythmical Latin by reason of the lack of skill on the part of the unknown Latinist. For a famous proconsul, Flaccianus by name, showed Augustine a Greek manuscript, say-

[1] XVIII. XXIII (ed. Hoffmann, 1900, ii. 297 f.) = *Oratio*, xviii. lines 19-28 (p. 179) and 1-17 (p. 180).

ing that it contained the songs of the Erythraean Sibyl, and he pointed out a certain passage which had the lines arranged in the style of an acrostic on the name of Christ. That is a valuable comment. There were two versions of this portion of the Sibyllines in Augustine's time; or more exactly at the time of the composition of *De Civitate Dei*, which was between 413 and 426.[1] We know very little indeed about Flaccianus. He is seen in a page from Augustine's pen and in a document contained in the Theodosian Code,[2] and we know no more about him. The date of the latter document, 393, and that of the probable writing of the eighteenth book of *De Civitate Dei*, shall we say about 425, will bring us to the round conclusion of African knowledge of the two versions in the beginning of the fifth century. Was there knowledge of these two versions in Byzantium some years before this date?

Lactantius did not know the acrostic. He was acquainted with a version of the Sibyllines in which some of its lines occurred. These, as we have said, were in their original context of vaticination concerning the Last Things, and with those values they were transferred to the pages of the *Institutiones*. The *Oratio* possesses the acrostic in a fuller form than Augustine,

[1] Schanz, *Die römische Litteratur von Constantin bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk Justinians*, 1904, iv. 1. 415.

[2] i. 12. 4.

and in Greek. Thus the problem stands for Byzantium.

But the *Oratio* makes Virgil a prophet of Jesus Christ in companionship with its creation of a Christological acrostic from Jewish eschatology. Virgil lisps his Roman sentiments with their new loyalty in translation Greek. Even the Latin lying behind the translation is not quite his own. Most critics have said that since the investigations of Rossignol.[1] The linguistic conditions of this Graecised *Vergiliana* have been discussed and remain unsettled as the criticisms manifest, for instance, on Pfättisch's contributions to our knowledge of the *Oratio*. A hitherto unrecognised factor can settle, it is believed, the problems as to what work, most alike and yet not quite the original, disturbed the musical serenity of Virgil's Latin and where that work was composed. Let us examine the line which begins thus: *κριθὴν ἠδὲ κύπειρον, ὁμοῦ κολακάσι ἀκάνθῳ.*[2] Virgil wrote: 'mixtaque ridenti colcasia fundet acantho.'[3] There is not any authority in Virgil for the first Greek word in that line. Rossignol exercised himself very much over it, and on scribal grounds argued for its virtual excision. He proposed to read in its stead, *κισσόν*; and with some involved

[1] *Virgile et Constantin le Grand* (1845). Only the first part of this work was published. The reference made in the text above is to i. 112 ff.

[2] *Orat.* xx. (p. 183). [3] *Ecl.* iv. 20.

play with lore taken from Pliny, to consider it as a sweet-smelling plant. A sensitive palaeographical eye will have great difficulty with his scribal hypothesis, and an inexacting botanical understanding can say that his second suggestion is a trifle too general. There is no need to treat the Greek word with such harshness. It does exhibit a slight scribal error, and it also stands for a word in a Byzantine piece of *Vergiliana*. The proof of these things is in the *Cento* by Proba,[1] where she transcribes the Ecolgue :

> Mixtaque ridenti passum cum baccare tellus
> Molli paulatim colocasia fundet acantho.

Thus the lines read in Schenkl's edition. But when we turn to his manuscript authorities, we find that the manuscript he marked A—whose date is ix.-x. century and is one of the best codices—reads ' lilia.' κρίνον is an ordinary word for ' lily.' The κριθὴν form in the text of the *Oratio* has come about through a simple linguistic slip on the part of the scribe—he thought that he was conjugating the verb κρίνω. Therefore, there was a version of *Eclogue* iv. in Constantinople not long after the death of Constantine, and it, or its translator into Greek, was influenced by the contemporary Virgilian *Cento* of Proba. She caused Virgil to see

[1] Lines 378-9, ed. Schenkl, 1888, 592 ; *C.S.E.L.* xvi. *Poetae Christiani Minores*. Ermini, *Il Centone di Proba e la poesia centonadia latina* (1909), is the most complete study on this style of poetry.

the Christ contemporaneously with the compiler—and it may be supposed the translator—of the *Oratio*, who evidently added him, together with the Sibylline acrostic, to the Lactantian *Testimonia* text which prophesied of Him. Proba was more than interested in the career of Constantine. She had written an epic on his war with Magnentius.[1] Her literary right to influence the composition of a work to glorify Constantine is thus amply vindicated. The Latin acrostic would have had in her a poetical godparent whose mate in inspiration was the Sibylline mother of the ancient Christological document upon which Lactantius had built his Apology. The fact that Proba could include a reference to her epic in the opening lines of the *Cento* is proof enough of their order of production. The date we may give to the latter work is about 351,[3] or almost half a century

[1] Cp. *Cento*, lines 47 ff., and Schenkl, *Prooemium*, 514.

[2] Not all the *Eclogue* matter found in the *Oratio* is in the *Cento*. The *Oratio* begins with its first line, Proba begins with its seventh = her 34; 18 = 377 ff.; 24 = 257; 27 = 523.

[3] Cp. *C.I.L.* vi. 1712; Seeck, *E. Aurelii Symmachi quae supersunt*, 1883 (*Mon. Germ. Auct. Antiq.* vi. i.), xcv.: Schenkl, *Prooem.* 513 f.; Schütte, *Studien über den Schriftstellers Katalog des hl. Isidor von Sevilla* (Sdralek, *Kirchengesch. Abhandl.* 1902), 110 and 126. Earlier literary critics had an exaggerated view of Proba's qualities as a poetess—*e.g.* Boccaccio, *De mulieribus claris*, 1473, ci.-cii., heaps upon her superlatives like 'dignissima' and 'eruditissima'; whilst Sisto of Sienna, *Bibliotheca Sancta*, 1575, 317, says: 'et quasi altera Christianorum Latina Sappho.' He must have viewed poetesses with the same manner of sight he applied to Prester John's library.

before Augustine comes upon its companion in literature.

Two other striking reasons for the literary and Christological conjunction of these documents lie on the surface. First, the declaration of Virgil[1] that he was listening to the Cumaean Sibyl would naturally give the *Eclogue* neighbourhood with the Sibyllines which were already in the *Testimonia* document, and which Lactantius knew alternatively as Cumaean or Erythraean Sibyls. And too for their inclusion among the *Testimonia* there was the added compulsion that in its Syrian version already Apolline matter had found an ancillary place. Second, in the *Institutiones*,[2] Lactantius actually sets these two orders of Sibyllines side by side, citing Virgil 'secundum Cumaeae Sibyllae, and the Jewish collection as 'Erythraea.' But he quotes Virgil as a literary illustration to enforce certain eschatological matters concerning which the Jewish Sibyllines speak in native manner.[3] It was left to Lactantius' literary inheritors to make Virgil and his Cumaean Sibyl prophets of the

[1] *Ecl.* iv. 4. [2] vii. 11-12.

[3] It is worthy of notice that Sedulius made an abstract of the two sorts of Sibylline matter from Lactantius. Montfaucon (*Palaeographia Graeca*, 1708, 235 ff.) has copied it from the end of the alleged autograph Psalter which belonged to the monastery of St. Michael in Lotharingia. Cp. Omont, *Mélanges Graux*, 1884, 313, with reproductions from the manuscript now in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, No. 8407; and Traube, *O Roma Nobilis*, 1892, 345; Gougaud, *Les Chrétientés Celtiques*

Christ. That great Roman poet was predestined to occupy a new rôle when the philosopher had put him into a curious literary fellowship. It was the work of a mythical Constantine the Great, and as he is found in his alleged *Oratio*, to endue Virgil with the spirit of a different prophecy and the vision of another king.

These findings are reducing the myth of Constantine the orator to its true values. They cannot, however, affect the reputation of Eusebius as historian. It is well to break off for a moment from the emperor to consider the bishop. We are inclined to judge him by our modern laboratory standards, or from the point of view of ecclesiastical demands of Western traditionalism. We can reduce Eusebius to being all wrong with Benjamin and Schultze, or we can uphold him as being all right with Duchesne and Pfättisch ; and in the end we ought to acknowledge that neither of these methods

1911, 248, *Gaelic Pioneers of Christianity*, 1923, 53. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, 1893, 116, thinks that the passage of Hepidannus which contains the name of Sedulius may have been interpolated, but that the manuscript was copied by an Irish scribe. In the British Museum is an unedited Latin manuscript, Royal 8, F. xi, written in a fourteenth century German hand, containing a tract entitled, *De Testimonium Genitilium de Christo*. It contains excerpts chiefly from Virgil, together with Ovid, Aristotle, etc. On fol. 22 *b*, the author cites the acrostic from the Erythraean Sibyl and some matter from Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 23 ; and on page 23 *a*, he proceeds to the Cumaean Sibyl, which is, of course, Virgil made to be a prophet of Jesus Christ.

of appraisement yields the true Eusebius. Constantinople was in his time very far from Caesarea. To-day even the early ages of man's life in the furthest countries are not far from us. Eusebius is supplied with Constantinian material from *scriptoria* in Constantinople. We can receive inscriptions from Mida mingled with their counterfeits from Birmingham, or Samaritan manuscripts from the Lebanon mixed with their exact counterparts done in the dark ways of Cairo, but we have exquisite tests to distinguish the good from the base. These seem to be the differences between writing a history of the fourth century in Caesarea and in the British Museum. Again, for all students of literature who can judge how and what a man writes, surely the first impression given by the writings of Eusebius is that he is an historian, and afterwards an apologist. These functions were not reversed when he wrote about Constantine. The picture of Constantine as a believer, which was presented in the documents from Constantinople, allied itself documentarily and spiritually with the things in which the bishop believed, and that fusion gave the world its religious Constantine the Great.

Thus also came about the super-episcopal view of the emperor at the Council of Nicaea. We cannot doubt the exercise of a presidential benevolence towards the Council. His edicts of tolerance, if nothing else, would warrant that view. But

the composers and scribes of documents in Constantinople after his death placed him on that higher bishop's throne, and thereon he passed into the pages of Eusebius. It cannot be wondered at, nor is Eusebius the historian in any sense blameworthy, that the emperor appears after this fashion in the standard histories of the Council of Nicaea.[1] To depose him is not a shock to the claim for Eusebian veracity, but to our sense of the picturesque in history and of stately sanction in religion. Moreover, his own history asks us to relieve him from his uneasy position. The Constantine who, late in his career, founded churches to *Irene* and *Sophia*, and was baptised at that period by an Arian bishop, is out of place both in the *Oratio* and in a super-episcopal position over the Council; simply because we cannot claim that at the time the emperor had developed in opinion from the Minervan *Sapientia* to the Arian *Sophia*. There is a profound difference between that *Sophia* and the Christ who has that name in the earliest Christological document. For the first is an abstraction of the second—a subtle unmaking of an historic person into an idea or virtue. Indeed, the investigator of to-morrow may demonstrate that Arius reached his views by a revolt against

[1] *e.g.* Gelasius of Cyzicus, *Historia Concilii Nicaeni*, i. 1 ff. (*P.G.* lxxxv. 1197*c* ff.); or later Baronius, *Annal.* iv. 72 ff. To make another leap over the centuries, we find that Constantine is given the same position in the *Histoire* by Duchesne.

the *Testimonia* teaching concerning the Christ who came into the world and was called the *Sophia*. The powers of the ancient document to throw light on early Christianity are as yet almost unknown. It is not improbable that when laid bare they will serve to revolutionise our views of these creative periods. These things impress one as being as certain as the opinion that Constantine's spiritual mobility would be of a curiously facile sort if he could be the advocate of a Logos Christology at Nicaea, be baptised by an Arian bishop, and raise a church to a *Sophia* concerning which we cannot be sure whether it is dedicated to a thinner abstraction than Arius taught—a kind of analogue to *Irene*. What appears to be probable is that the process in Constantine's mind was to go slowly from the Minervan *Sapientia* towards some appreciation of the Christ who was the *Sophia*, and that thus he could accept baptism at the hands of Eusebius of Nicomedia who does not appear to have been a rigid Arian.[1] Such a spiritual history is far removed from the Christology of the *Oratio*, and even further removed from the Christology of the official Nicaean opinion.[2]

The composer of the *Oratio* appears to have had

[1] Cp. Lichtenstein, *Eusebius von Nikomedien*, 1903, 96 ff.

[2] Cp. *e.g.* Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 1855, i. 246 ff. What was an offset to Arianism could not be, by its controversial rise, the Christology of the first great years of Christianity.

an aesthetic appreciation of the gaps between the beliefs that Constantine held and those he should hold; since we find him, for instance, after a long prologue of a Neo-Platonic order—which was the bridge the panegyrists flung between Paganism and Christianity—dipping down to a concept of Christ which belongs to the earliest Christianity.[1] It belongs to the alphabet of Christology, as can be seen from some of the early sermons in the Acts of the Apostles.[2] These gleams of *Testimonia* Christology are the touches of verisimilitude in the *Oratio* so far as the beliefs of Constantine go; since they mark the sort of Christian view towards which he was thinking. For though the author of the *Oratio*, after his expression of alphabetic Christology, lingers among the material which served to teach it to men and women, yet his mind finds itself again when he concludes with paragraphs of approaches to Neo-Platonic ideas. Such matters had wings too delicate and iridescent for the mind of the historic Constantine. His Minervan *Sapientia* was too Roman and of the earth, and his progress away from it too slow, for him suddenly to acquire a Christian *Sophia* with wings which tirelessly beat in the air of high argument. They were ornaments that perhaps were suitable to an emperor, but they would have been too broad and swift in their powers of flight for a Bishop

[1] *e.g. Oratio*, xi. (p. 167), Χριστόν, *θεόν τε καὶ θεοῦ παῖδα*.

[2] Acts, iii. 13, etc.; *Didache*, ix.

Extraordinary who presided at Nicaea. The Christology of that Council was far from that first Christology which made Christianity, and it would have been further from it, away in an empyrean of ideas which elude the hold of the mind, had the Neo-Platonic energies of the Constantine depicted in the *Oratio* been applied to its definitions.

Thus the myth of Constantine as orator passes. And with it must pass some other things which have been and are taught in Western traditionalism. The first thing to do is to realise that as there is not evidential ground for the emperor's belief in a Christology based on the historic person of Jesus Christ, so also there is even less reason to suppose that he had a *cultus* for Peter or any other Apostle. The foundation of the basilica of S. Peter rests on the same foundation as the Roman baptism of Constantine at the hands of Pope Silvester. Where Constantine had no place for the Master there was none for the servant; since history does not permit us to believe that the objects of his worship were ever embodied in persons. Apollo was too old to be such. And when Constantine raised an Apolline statue and gave to it, as certain say, the nails of the crucifixion of Christ to beray the god's head, or transfused to it, as some say, values of himself, he could not endow it with the vital graces of personality. Indeed, there is good authority in the Spelio inscription that Constantine permitted

only the worship of his name and not of himself.[1] No impulse comes from his pre-Christian belief towards worship centred in persons, nor is there historical ground for any transforming experience, like the coming of swift dawn, which turned his mind from belief in the Minervan *Sapientia* to the *Sophia* who was Jesus Christ. We may not expect, then, to find a scrap of evidence for the opinion that Constantine held Peter in reverence who, like Paul, was a slave of that *Sophia*.[2]

Were there touches or material in the lost *Vita Constantini* to adumbrate this myth of Constantine as orator? There were both influences. It has been shown how large a place in that *Vita* must have been given to the Sabine associations of the emperor. Now the Soractean Apollo is the other self of the Cumaean Apollo. At Cumae Apollo had grown up to forget the primitive animals whence he had sprung; on Soracte, the lore of his origins was still about him. When the latter was brought to the Capitoline hill he did not lose those first meanings. The Sabines were not satisfied with bringing Apollo and his Wolf to Rome. They also brought him as the

[1] 'ne aedis nostro nomini dedicata'—the prohibition is against any other superstition polluting the temple; see Dessau, *I.S.L. ad loc.*

[2] Cp. Origen, *Expositio in Proverbia*, ix. (*P.G.* xvii. 185 *c*): εἰ Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος δοῦλος Χριστοῦ, ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς σοφιά ἐστι, Παῦλος γὰρ ὁ ἀπόστολος δοῦλος τῆς σοφίας ἐστίν, and Burch, *op. cit.* 146.

Sibyl.[1] For Apollo and Cumae and the Tarquin kings were associated indissolubly in the ancient legends of Rome. The Sabine foundation of the *Vita Constantini* would have been another reason, beyond those we have discovered, for the dual grouping together of Apolline[2] and Erythraean Sibyllines—first in a Constantinople *Testimonia*, and then in the *Oratio* ascribed to Constantine. There is a way of spiritual pilgrimage cut deeply in the history of the emperor which leads from Soracte, over the Capitoline hill, and down to the Golden Horn. When Constantine passed over that way for the first time, the Claudian purple was placed on his shoulders. His second journey apparently conferred on him the oak-leaf crown of the Julian gens.[3] This was a posthumous honour. It is true that he had succeeded to the throne that both these had set up, and the scope

[1] Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* i. 6, 10, who quotes Varro; Servius, *ad Aen.* vi. 72; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xiii. 88.

[2] We must remember that Constantine becomes associated with the burden of certain of the Klarian Oracles, cp. Wolff, *De Novissima Oraculorum Aetate*, 1854, 3 f.; Buresch, *Klaros*, 1889, 100 f. Constantine II. also consulted the Klarian Oracle—Ammianus Marcellinus, xix. 2; Perdrizet et Lefebvre, *Les Graffites Grecs du Memnonian d'Abydos*, 1919, xxii.

[3] Following the interpretation of Skutsch, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit*, 1901, 156 ff. for *Eclogue*, iv.; Raper, *Classical Review*, 1913, 15 f.; Fowler's essay in Mayor, *Virgil's Messianic Eclogue*, 1907; Haight, *American Journal of Philology*, 1918, 349 f. On the oak crown of the Julian gens, see especially Cook, *Classical Review*, 1904, 363 ff.

of whose power he had made greater than their dreams. But the real Constantine is never the Constantine of the panegyrists and makers of myth. He goes his way of pilgrimage, as the lost *Vita Constantini* would have told us, with the set of his spirit from his native Dacia [1] joining naturally with the Sabine Apollo and Romano-Sabine worship of *Sol*; and it would proceed to narrate how when he came to the Golden Horn the faint shadow was pencilled on his spirit of a Shepherd's crook and a crown of thorns. There was not more than this tenuous shadow. The Minervan *Sapientia* had kept him from going on to the *Sophia* whose other name was Christ; and the augural staff of Romulus was more actual to him than the crook of the Shepherd.

[1] See *e.g.* Marienescu, *Cultulu Paganu şi Chreştinu*, 1884, 386 ff., where the Rumanian scholar discusses the association of Zamolxis and Apollo.

INDEX TO AUTHORS CITED

Acta Concil. Antioch., 147.
Acta SS., 6, 15, 33, 150, 151.
Acta Thomae, 155.
Ado Viennensis, 74.
Aelian, 80.
Agathangelos, 43.
Albericus, 74.
Aldhelm, 118, 119, 120, 121.
Alexius III., 148.
Ammianus Marcellinus, 225.
Angier, 35.
Anna Comnena, 6, 56.
Anonymus Valesiani, 109.
Antiquitates Constp., 151.
Assemanus, 157.
Athanasius, 51, 147.
Aucher, 153.
Augustine, 88, 212, 218.
Aulus Gellius, 113, 145.

Babélon, 113.
Bardenhewer, 192.
Barnabas, 188, 191.
Baronius, 8, 220.
Batiffol, 139.
Baynes, viii.
Becker, 185, 189.
Beda, 74.
Bekker, 83.
Benedict, 34.
Benjamin, 184, 186.
Berger, 218.
Bernays, 86.
Bidez, 128, 150.
Boccaccio, 216.
Boissevain, 101.
Bonifacio, 86.
Bonizo, 74.
Brandt, 107, 192.
Breal, 91.
Brosset, 43, 45.
Browne, 119.
Budge, 153.
Büchler, 70.
Burch, 170, 171, 187, 189, 193, 208, 224.
Burckhardt, 87.
Buresch, 225.
Bury, 192.

Carrière, 43.
Cato, 129.
Cedrenus, 151.
Cenni, 35.
Cerratti, 14, 19.
Chassot von Florencourt, 111.
Chronica Gallica, 99.
Ciampini, 23, 152.
Cicero, 8, 57, 96.
Clermont-Ganneau, 1.
Cloran, 35.
Codinus, 56, 97, 146, 151, 156.
Cohn, 102.
Coleman, 3, 28, 108, 116, 126, 192.
Combefis, 158.
Conrad of Würzburg, 26, 27.
Constantine vii., 189.
Constantine the Rhodian, 56, 156, 178.

Conway, 70.
Conybeare, 198.
Cook, 45, 58, 82, 88, 89, 90, 198, 225.
C.I. Etrusc, 70.
C.I.L., 63, 66, 206.
Coustant, 122.
Crivellucci, 7, 195.
Cyprian, 189, 211.

Dante, 41.
De la Haye, 154.
De Rossi, 22, 47, 122, 199.
Descriptio Urbis Constp., 175.
Dessau, 54, 105, 139, 224.
De Vita Caesarum, 113.
Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus, 170.
Dialogus Christiani contra Sarracenum, 51.
Didache, 222.
Dionysius Alex., 147.
Dionysius Halik,, 82, 113.
Dionysius Rom., 147.
Dodwell, 79.
Dölger, 28, 62.
Döllinger, 72.
Dracontius, 59.
Duchesne, 11, 13, 15, 28, 196.
Dübner, 69, 130.
Du Fresne, 179.
Duval, 46.

Ehses, 20.
Ehwald, 117.
Ekkehard Urangiensis, 72.
Engelhard, 141.
Ennius, 57, 59.
Epimenides, 45.
Ermini, 215.
Etymol. Mag., 176.
Eumenius, 105, 110.
Eusebius, 4, 9, 62, 109, 147, 156, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188, 211, 212, 214, 216, 222.
Eustathius, 77.
Eutropius, 109, 141.
Evagrius, 170.

Fabricius, 86.
Farnell, 70.
Ferrarius, 45.
Ferrero, 200.
Ferrucci, 18.
Festus, 63.
Fowler, 69, 92, 225.
Franchi de Cavalieri, 128.
Frazer, 65, 69.
Freculfus, 74.
Fredegarius, 73.
Friedrich, 116.
Frothingham, 15, 16.
Fumagalli and Beltrami, 122.
Fulvio, 16.

Gams, 45, 160.
Gaster, 115.
Geffcken, 210.
Gelasius of Cyzicus, 220.
Gelzer, 77.
George, 136.
George Hamartolus, 56, 199.
George the Monk, 128, 166.
Glykas, 56.
Gneichi, 141, 144.
Godfrey Viterbiensis, 74.
Göteke, 107.
Gougaud, 217.
Gravina, 44.
Gregory of Tours, 74.
Gregory Thaum., 147.
Gregory the Great, 33.
Grisar, 23, 34.
Guidi, 47.
Gyllius, 151.

Hadrian, 73.
Haight, 225.
Harduin, 33.
Harnack, 201.
Harris and Burch, 147, 170, 188, 189, 205, 208.

Harris and Mingana, 209.
Hase and Creuza, 100.
Haussleiter, 207.
Hecht, 35.
Hefele, 221.
Heikel, 201, 202, 210.
Heinisch, 184.
Henzen, 63.
Hermann Contractus, 73.
Héron de Villefosse, 67.
Hesychius (*Lex.*), 61.
'Hesychius (*Orig. Constp.*), 176, 178.
Hettner, 111.
Heyd, 148.
Hincmar, 74.
Hippolytus, 147.
Hirschfield, 141.
Honorati, 136.
Horace, 63.
Hugo Floriacensis, 73.
Huttmann, 143.

Idatii Fasti, 97, 135.
Indulgentia eccl. principalium alme Urbis Romae, 162.
Isho'dad of Merv, 45.
Isidore Hisp., 73, 171.
Irenaeus, 170, 191.

Jacobacci, 16.
Jaffé, 35.
James, 37. 38.
Jansen, 200.
Joannes Damasc., 51.
Joannes Lydus, 63, 76, 89, 102, 103.
Joannes Malalas, 77, 199.
Johannes Antioch, 47.
Johannes Turrecremata, 51.
Julian, 56, 87, 109.
Julius Honorius, 79.
Julius Pollux, 199.
Justin, 70.
Justinian, 79.
Justin Martyr, 168, 191, 209.

Kaiserchronik, 26, 27.
Kirakos, 43.
Krüger, 202.

Lanciani, 23.
Land, 41.
Lactantius, 167, 191, 192, 204, 217, 225.
Lactantius Placidus, 173.
Lawlor, 192.
Legenda, 124, 125, 163, 166, 167, 172, 173, 174, 179.
Leo Grammaticus, 199.
Leo IX., 74.
Lethaby and Swainson, 123, 135.
Lettera di Constantino gran Cesare, 44.
Lewis, 155.
Liber Pontificalis, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 23, 24, 34, 40, 121.
Lichtenstein, 221.
Lippomanus-Surius, 50, 51, 120, 154.
Livy, 63, 82, 113, 129.
Löscheke, 202.
Loofs, 29.
Lucilius, 67.
Lübert, 113.

Mabillon, 34, 39.
Macrobius, 101, 102, 104.
Mai, 22.
Mancini, 201, 202, 210.
Manitius, 119, 121.
Mannhardt, 65.
Mansi, 48.
MSS. Adds. B.M. 26, 114, 154.
MSS. Royal F xi. B.M., 218.
Marianus Scotus, 74.
Marienescu, 226.
Marini, 23, 37.
Martinov, 152.
Martinus Polonus, 74.
Martyrium Acacii, 153.

Maurice, 56, 97, 112, 134, 141, 142, 143, 148, 150, 198.
Mauso, 195.
Maximus Planudes, 100, 102.
Melchior, 147.
Milani, 54.
Mommsen, 113.
Monceaux, 207.
Montfaucon, 217.
Morcelli, 149.
Moulton, 70.
Müller, 101.
Müntz, 15.
Muratori, 22.

Narratio de structura templi S. Sophiae, 157.
Nazarius, 112.
Nicephorus Callistus, 56, 152.
Nicholas Mesarites, 156, 178.
Nicholas of Cues, 72.
Niebuhr, 83.
Niese, 82.
Nonius Marcellus, 64, 67.
Nonnus, 176.

Odes of Solomon, 191, 206.
Omont, 217.
Oracula Sibyllina, 210, 216.
Ordericus Vitalis, 73, 74.
Origen, 147, 224.
Otto, 54.
Otto Freisingensis, 73.
Ovid, 63, 92, 95, 100.

Paget, 187.
Pais, 70, 78, 82.
Pamphilus, 147.
Panzer, 16, 162.
Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 156, 159.
Paribeni, 67.
Paschal Chronicle, 77, 98, 134.
Passio S. Artemii, 156.
Pastor, 20.
Πατ. Κωνστ., 97, 128.
Paulo dal Rosso, 18.
Paul I., 34, 35.
Pease, 130.
Perdrizet and Lefebvre, 225.
Peter, 66, 186.
Pfättisch, 201.
Philostorgius, 56, 127.
Philotheus Selymbriensis, 150.
Photius, 160, 161.
Piccolomini, 101.
Pichon, 193, 194, 204.
Pieper, 20.
Pius II., 87.
Pliny, 60, 61, 62, 67, 88, 225.
Plutarch, 12, 70, 93, 95.
Pole, 21.
Politianus, 86.
Polybius, 176.
Pothast, 34.
Preger, 12, 86, 97, 98, 162.
Preuschen, 155.
Proba, 215, 216.
Proclus, 199.
Propertius, 66.
Prosper Aq., 47, 51.
Pseudo-Athanasius, 148.
Pseudo-Lactantius, 193.
Ptolemaeus Lucensis, 73.
Pulgher, 134.

Quirini, 21.

Radulf de Diceto, 124.
Rapp, 198.
Rasponi, 47.
Renel, 94, 96.
Reusen, 37.
Riant, 160.
Robert, 58, 88.
Rohault de Fleury, 47.
Romualdus, 73.
Rossignol, 201, 214.
Rufinus, 74, 185, 191.
Ryssel, 40.
Rzach, 204.

Samouelian, 45.
Samuel Marochitanus, 51.
Sarrazin, 150.
Sathas, 56.
Sboronos, 198.
Schanz, 213.
Schirmer, 90.
Scholium (Demosthenes), 69.
Scholium (Sophocles), 70.
Scholz, 149, 157.
Schremmer, 198.
Schütte, 216.
Schultze, 186.
Schwartz, 201.
Sedulius, 206.
Seeck, 99, 105, 114, 126, 134, 186, 216.
Seneca, 58.
Servius, 52, 53, 65, 84, 225.
Shedler, 100.
Sicard Cremonensis, 73.
Sisto of Sienna, 216.
Skutsch, 225.
Socrates, 56, 79, 136, 178, 180.
Sozomen, 3, 79, 126.
Statius, 173.
Steffens, 122.
Stephanus Byz., 78, 79, 90, 176.
Strabo, 63, 90.
Strzygowski, 87.
Sylloge Einsiedlensis, 22.

Tacitus, 113.
Tambroni, 70.
Taylor, 54, 67.
Themistius, 134.
Theodoret, 9.
Theodorus Abucura, 51.
Theodosius, 3, 126.
Theodosius Melit., 199.
Theophanes, 56, 97, 199.
Theophilus of Antioch, 210.
Thompson, 38.
Thurneysen, 54.
Tomassetti, vii. 41.
Traube, 217.
Trebellius Pollio, 108, 112, 182.
Tzetzes, 56.

Ughelli, 41.

Van Hoesen, 36, 37.
Van Millingan, 133.
Vanstenberghe, 73.
Varro, 63, 65, 89, 91, 94, 129.
Vartabad Matthew, 44.
Vaschide, 115.
Virgil, 63, 65, 113, 214, 217.
Vincelius, 174.
Vincentius Bellovac, 72.
Vita Constantini (*Cod. Angelic. Gr.* 22), 85.
Vita S. Gregorii Armen. Legenda Suecana, 44.
Voetter, 96, 144.
Volpe, 44.

Waerfurth of Worcester, 35.
Weidner, 107.
Wendland, 201.
Whiston, 31.
Wide, 69.
William of Malmesbury, 124.
Windisch, 188.
Witte, 85.
Wolff, 206, 225.
Wünsch, 81, 83.

Zacharias (Pope), 34.
Zielinski, viii.
Zonoras, 86, 97, 113, 199.
Zucchi, 122.
Zvetaief, 91.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

BIBLICAL CITATIONS

	PAGE
Gen. i. 26	167
Ex. xvii. 9 ff.	189, 190
Num. xxiv. 17	206
ii. S. vii. 4 ff.	206
i. K. viii. 9	189
ii. Chron. v. 10	189
Ps. ii. 17	167, 168
vii. 14	167
xxvii. 4 f.	206
xxxii. 6	167
xlvii. 7 f.	206
l. 13	167
lxxxiv. 12	206
lxxxviii. 27	167
cix. 1	206
Is. vii. 17	206
Is. ix. 6	206
xi. 1 f.	206
xix. 20	206
xlviii. 1 ff.	206
lxiii. 10 f.	206
Jer. xvii. 9	206
Dan. vii. 13 f.	206
Zech. iii. 1 f.	167
Wisdom, ii.	170
ii. 12	167
vii. 25 ff.	155
Baruch, iii. 36 f.	167, 206
Lk. iii. 22	167, 168
Acts iii. 13	222
ix. 18	61
Phil. iii. 13	190

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY ROBERT MACLEHOSE AND CO. LTD.
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, GLASGOW.

18430

DG
315
B87

Burch, Vacher.

Myth & Constantine the Great, by Vacher Burch ... London, Oxford university press, H. Milford, 1927.

viii p., 1 l., 281, [1] p. 23cm.

1. Constantinus I, the Great, emperor of Rome, d. 337. I. Title.

27-19531